

BS491  
.B58  
48



Division A  
Section F  
100





✓  
*THE BIBLE FOR HOME AND SCHOOL*

SHAILER MATHEWS, GENERAL EDITOR

PROFESSOR OF HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## GALATIANS

BENJAMIN W. BACON

THE BIBLE FOR HOME AND SCHOOL  
SHAILER MATHEWS, GENERAL EDITOR

GENESIS

BY PROFESSOR H. G. MITCHELL

ACTS

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. GILBERT

HEBREWS

BY PROFESSOR E. J. GOODSPEED

GALATIANS

BY PROFESSOR B. W. BACON

*VOLUMES IN PREPARATION*

I SAMUEL

BY PROFESSOR L. W. BATTEN

PSALMS

BY REVEREND J. P. PETERS

ISAIAH

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. MCFADYEN

JUDGES

BY PROFESSOR EDWARD L. CURTIS

JOB

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE A. BARTON

AMOS, HOSEA, AND MICAH

BY PROFESSOR J. M. P. SMITH

MARK

BY PROFESSOR M. W. JACOBUS

JOHN

BY PROFESSOR SHAILER MATHEWS

ROMANS

BY PROFESSOR E. I. BOSWORTH

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS

BY REVEREND GROSS ALEXANDER

THE BIBLE FOR HOME AND SCHOOL

---

COMMENTARY

ON

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE  
GALATIANS

BY

BENJAMIN W. BACON, D.D., LL.D.

BUCKINGHAM PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND  
EXEGESIS IN YALE UNIVERSITY



New York  
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
1909

*All rights reserved*

COPYRIGHT, 1909,  
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

---

Set up and electrotyped. Published September, 1909.

**Norwood Press**  
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.  
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

THE BIBLE FOR HOME AND SCHOOL is intended to place the results of the best modern biblical scholarship at the disposal of the general reader. It does not seek to duplicate other commentaries to which the student must turn. Its chief characteristics are (*a*) its rigid exclusion of all *processes*, both critical and exegetical, from its notes; (*b*) its presupposition and its use of the assured results of historical investigation and criticism wherever such results throw light on the biblical text; (*c*) its running analysis both in text and comment; (*d*) its brief explanatory notes adapted to the rapid reader; (*e*) its thorough but brief Introductions; (*f*) its use of the Revised Version of 1881, supplemented with all important renderings in other versions.

Biblical science has progressed rapidly during the past few years, but the reader still lacks a brief, comprehensive commentary that shall extend to him in usable form material now at the disposition of the student. It is hoped that in this series the needs of intelligent Sunday School teachers have been met, as well as those of clergymen and lay readers, and that in scope, purpose, and loyalty to the Scriptures as a foundation of Christian thought and life, its volumes will stimulate the intelligent use of the Bible in the home and the school.



## CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
I. TEXT . . . . .	I
II. CANONICITY . . . . .	4
III. AUTHORSHIP . . . . .	7
IV. RELATION TO THE STORY OF PAUL IN ACTS . . . . .	11
V. TO WHOM GALATIANS WAS WRITTEN . . . . .	17
1. The Churches of Galatia . . . . .	18
2. The North Galatian Theory . . . . .	20
3. The Pauline Geography . . . . .	24
VI. DATE AND OCCASION OF THE LETTER . . . . .	25
1. Relation of Galatians to Romans . . . . .	26
2. Internal Indications . . . . .	29
3. The Judaizers and their Success among the Galatians . . . . .	33
4. The Historical Order of Events in Paul's Missionary Career . . . . .	38
VII. ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE . . . . .	41
VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	43
TEXT AND COMMENTARY . . . . .	47
APPENDED NOTES . . . . .	113
A. The Content of Paul's Gospel . . . . .	115
B. The Jerusalem Compact, and the Apostolic Decrees . . . . .	118
C. Justification by Faith, "Apart from" Works of Law . . . . .	129
INDEX . . . . .	133



## INTRODUCTION

### I. TEXT

ALTHOUGH from the very outset the Epistle to the Galatians was adapted for circulation among a number of "churches" (1: 2), we have no traces of it in separate form, and can merely infer from the better acquaintance of the very earliest writers such as Luke<sup>1</sup> and Clement of Rome (*ca.* 95 A.D.) with Romans, First Corinthians, and Ephesians, that there was a period extending approximately to 110 A.D. during which the letters of Paul circulated as individual writings. Those addressed to the remoter churches would thus be less widely known. Books had at this time the form of *volumina*, or scrolls of papyrus, and could not well be made to include so extensive a work as the whole series of Pauline Epistles. Still, so early as the time of Ignatius and Polycarp (110-117 A.D.) these are referred to as "the letters of Paul," and assumed to be current as a body of writings by study of which the churches may be "built up." In fact the first canon of Christian writings of which we have definite information, set up about 145 A.D. by Marcion, the great leader of the anti-Jewish Gnostic heresy, consisted of two parts, a "Gospel" adapted from our Luke, and an "Apostle" which began with Galatians and included all the other letters of Paul save the Pastoral Epistles. By the end of the second century it was considered quite axiomatic that "the Apostle Paul himself following the example of his predecessor John" should have "written by name to seven churches only, in this order: First to the Corinthians, second

<sup>1</sup> In giving this traditional name to the author of the third Gospel and book of Acts the present writer does not wish to be understood as admitting the full validity of the tradition.

to the Ephesians, third to the Philippians, fourth to the Colossians, fifth to the Galatians, sixth to the Thessalonians, seventh to the Romans."<sup>1</sup>

The earliest extant texts of Galatians belong to a period two centuries later still, and happen to be included in copies of the entire Greek Bible of Old and New Testaments. For by 400 A.D. these writings were easily comprised between the covers of a single codex, or "book" of the modern form. However, we also have codices of later date which comprise the Pauline Epistles only, showing that these still also circulated as a separate literary unit.

The great codices of about 400 A.D., designated Aleph and B, or the Sinaitic and Vatican Bibles, present somewhat divergent forms of the type of text current in Alexandria about 200-400 A.D., and this type is also represented, though in a form showing systematic emendation, by the fragmentary rewritten Codex C, or Ephraem Syrus, of about 500 A.D., which fortunately contains all but the first nineteen verses of Galatians. Of similar type are the fragments of the so-called Cod. Coislinianus (H) at Petersburg and Mt. Athos, containing respectively Gal. 1 : 4-10; 2 : 9-14, and 1 : 1-4; 2 : 14-17; 4 : 30-5 : 5. With these may be grouped as partially "Alexandrian" the ninth century codices of Acts, Catholic Epistles and Pauline Epistles, designated respectively Cod. Angelicus (L) and Cod. Porphyrianus (P), the latter including also Revelation.

A different, less carefully revised, type of text, very improperly designated "Western," is represented, for the Pauline Epistles only, by the sixth century, bilingual (Greek and Latin in parallel columns), Codex Claromontanus (D), and by a group of three similar bilinguals of the ninth century, Petropolitanus or Sangermanensis (E), Augiensis (F), and Boernerianus (G); but of these E is only an unintelligent transcript of D, and has no independent value.

Codex Alexandrinus (A), in the British Museum, an entire

<sup>1</sup> *Muratorian Fragment*, 200-210 A.D. The author conceives of the seven letters of Rev. 1-3 as written before the Pauline Epistles.

Greek Bible, is earlier in date than any of the foregoing save Aleph and B, but represents a later type of text than either the Alexandrian or Western; for while the copyist possessed a less altered exemplar for the Pauline Epistles than for the four Gospels, it still shows a blending of Alexandrian with Western readings. C and the secondary uncial L and P are often found in agreement with A; but readings thus attested are usually of late origin, and are called "Syrian." Finally there will soon be available a valuable though fragmentary manuscript of the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews belonging to the fifth or sixth century, brought to America from Egypt by Charles L. Freer, Esq., in 1907. Its type of text cannot be fully determined until its appearance in the promised edition in photographic facsimile, but it is said to contain "Syrian" as well as "Alexandrian" readings.

There is also available for determination of the text of the Pauline Epistles some further evidence. 1. That of the cursive or small letter manuscripts of the tenth and later centuries, some of which show from their readings that they were copied from really ancient exemplars. 2. That of the various early translations into Egyptian, Syriac, Armenian, and Latin. 3. That of a multitude of quotations by Greek and Latin fathers of the Church. When it is possible, as it frequently is, to determine which of several variant readings these translators or fathers had before them, we are enabled to say in general what type of text was current in Egypt, in Syria and Greece, or in Italy, North Africa, and Gaul so early even as the latter part of the second century. We can even measure pretty closely the degree of variation, and establish many individual readings.

The impression apt to be produced by the very magnitude of the material at command for determination of the New Testament text, and the prodigious pains taken by generations of scholars to determine the origin and value of each minutest variation, is an impression of uncertainty, as though it were difficult to be sure exactly what the authors

wrote. The logical impression should be just the contrary. The real result is to make this text incomparably more exact and trustworthy than that of any other writing of equal antiquity in the whole domain of literature. The changes of the R. V. of 1881 from the A. V. of 1611 exhibit about the maximum difference between a wholly uncritical, corrupt text and a thoroughly scientific one. From a comparison of these the reader will see to how slight an extent the real substance of the writing is affected by textual criticism. We may safely say, The difference between the text of Galatians as it left the hand of Paul's amanuensis and as it appears to-day in any modern Greek New Testament is not greater than the difference between our Authorized and our Revised Version as a whole.

## II. CANONICITY

The process of canonization was of the utmost value in the preservation of the text from corruption. We have seen that so early as 145 A.D. ten of the principal epistles of Paul were formed into a true "canon" or collection of writings treated as sacred and authoritative "scripture" suitable for public reading in the churches. The anticipation of the ecclesiastical process thus noted in the case of the Gnostic Marcion was due to his peculiar anti-Judaistic doctrine, which utterly rejected the Old Testament, and magnified Paul's quarrel with the Galilean apostles. Having thrown overboard the "sacred scriptures" of the Church, without being able to remove the need supplied in both Synagogue and Church by the use of these writings, Marcion was the more rapidly driven along the course on whose first stages the Church had already entered. For even before Marcion, as we have seen, Church leaders like Clement of Rome (95 A.D.) and Ignatius (110-117 A.D.) were already making use of individual letters, and Polycarp (110-117 A.D.) was even commanding a corpus Paulinum to the churches, as the standard of apostolic doctrine, and a means of edifica-

tion. Indeed while we must admit that the actual canonization of any individual writing was a process of slow growth in the Church, extending over many generations, and the determination of the precise limits of the canon so much slower still as to be not wholly complete in our own day, nevertheless, there is a sense in which we may say of the Pauline Epistles that they were "canonical" from the very outset. Not that Paul had any idea of their being collected and attached to the sacred rolls of the Law and the Prophets, which he quotes with such reverence as the word of God; but that he was saturated, dominated, and controlled by the idea that his whole life was "inspired." If of his life in general he could say, "It is no more I that live, but Christ that liveth in me," how much more the Gospel which came to him by "revelation of the Lord," the "visions and revelations" in which he heard "words that are not lawful to utter," caught away into the third heaven and not knowing whether he was "in the body or out of the body"? Paul believed that his very word of anathema was enough to bring death upon an offending member (1 Cor. 5:5). He knew he "spoke with tongues more than they all" (1 Cor. 14:18); he had done the signs of an apostle in miracles and wonders of healing by direct endowment of the Spirit (Rom. 15:18, 19; 2 Cor. 12:12); and he believed that when he gave advice, even unsupported by any express "word of the Lord," he also had "the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 7:40). If even a Clement could look upon his own letter (lix) as "words spoken by God through us," and an Ignatius his own utterance as "God's own voice" (*To the Philadelphians*, vii), surely such a "chosen vessel" of the Spirit as Paul was justified, in the conviction of that earlier and still more enthusiastic age, in regarding his weighty letters as conveying "what the Spirit saith unto the churches." In a true sense it is with these letters, carefully and laboriously constructed as they are, notwithstanding their volcanic fervor of conviction, that New Testament canonicity begins. Of course the "words

of the Lord" already constitute to Paul a far higher standard (1 Cor. 7:10, 12; 1 Thess. 4:15; cf. 1 Tim. 6:3); but, little as Paul would seem to have depended on it, this very tradition of the Lord's sayings owes to none other than to Paul himself so much of the reverence with which it came to be regarded (1 Tim. 6:3 (*ca.* 90 A.D.); Polycarp, *Philadelphians*, vii). And this was not as yet a written tradition. That the process should ever have begun which in the course of 150 years was destined to place alongside of the revered Scriptures of "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms" a second canon of "Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse,"<sup>1</sup> equal or even superior in authority to the Old Testament, is due very largely to the intense mysticism of Paul. For Paul was convinced that he himself spoke "God's wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden, foreordained before the worlds unto our glory," unknown to even the angelic and demonic "rulers of the world," and revealed only by the indwelling "mind of Christ" (1 Cor. 2:7-16). The greatest step, if not the very first, in this significant process of the formation of a Holy Scripture of the New Testament was the writing of Paul's circular letter "to the churches of Galatia," pouring out his whole soul in passionate defence of the divine origin of his apostleship and of his gospel. Needless, almost, to say, since the time when Marcion adopted it and made it the foundation stone of his *Apostolos*, it has never entered the mind of the Church, or any branch of it, to question the standing and authority thus recognized by common consent. The occasional objections raised since the middle of the nineteenth century by a few extremists who question even the historical existence of Jesus and Paul, have nothing whatever to do with the *canonicity* of the writing. This is a matter which rests upon grounds independent even of authenticity. Canonicity is a question for the Church to determine on the basis of its own experi-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Justin M. *Apol.* I. vi. "We reverence and bow to God, and to the Son who came from him and taught us these things, and to the prophetic Spirit."

ence of benefit to its spiritual life; and this question, so far as Galatians is concerned, passed out of the field of debate some eighteen centuries ago; or more strictly speaking has never entered it at all.

### III. AUTHORSHIP

It is difficult to think of any writing of antiquity whose reputed authorship could not be denied with greater plausibility than the Pauline authorship of Galatians. But just because of the vital issues which in recent times have been felt to hinge upon it, the attempt has been made. And we may be thankful that it has; because the complete security of the writer's claim to be no other than the Apostle Paul himself (1 : 1, 17; 2 : 1, 7, 11; 6 : 11, 17) is thus established by processes of the higher criticism, just as textual criticism establishes the accuracy of the text.

It is true that Galatians appears to be somewhat less widely known in the earliest period<sup>1</sup> than First Corinthians and Romans, but as the most morbid hypercriticism has never soared to such a pitch as to separate the three epistles in date of origin by more than about a decade, even when attributing them to different hands,<sup>2</sup> the existence of one clearly implies the existence of the other two. If Galatians stood alone, we should be confined to such employments of it in the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp (110-117 A.D.) as Lightfoot (*Commentary*, Introd., § iv) enumerates, and those in a writing of the same region and period, the Gospel of John,<sup>3</sup> to prove its early date. We might add the use of the doctrine of the new birth from "spiritual seed" (Gal. 4 : 4-7, 28-31), a doctrine which not only re-

<sup>1</sup> For one reason see above, p. 1. Quite probably the bitterly polemic character of Galatians and 2 Corinthians prevented their attaining general circulation so early as Romans, 1 Corinthians and Ephesians.

<sup>2</sup> R. Steck, *Galaterbrief*, 1888, brought forward and ably advocated a theory which made all the Pauline Epistles spurious products of the second century. Galatians was by a later hand than Romans and Corinthians, and was dependent on these and on Acts. All four, however, he held to have been produced between 120 and 130 A.D.

<sup>3</sup> With Gal. 3 : 28-4 : 7, cf. Jn. 8 : 31-42.

appears in the Gospel of John,<sup>1</sup> but also in First Peter,<sup>2</sup> another writing of this region almost certainly known to Clement of Rome (95 A.D.). Against this it might be urged that the author of Acts seems to be unacquainted with our Epistle, and the same is possibly true of his contemporary Clement. It must also be admitted that Justin Martyr (153-160 A.D.), while admittedly showing acquaintance with several Pauline Epistles, makes comparatively little use of them as authority. But Galatians does not stand alone. Evidence for First Corinthians and Romans is evidence for it also. Now Clement in writing to the Corinthians reminds them that "the blessed Paul the Apostle" had written them an epistle "in the beginning of the gospel," in which (xlvii, cf. 1 Cor. 1 : 10-12) "he charged you in the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because that even then ye had made parties." Clement also uses Romans, and what is more, employs no less than forty-seven times the Epistle to the Hebrews, which also uses Romans,<sup>3</sup> and while making no claims whatever to apostolicity purports to be written at a time when Timothy was still in active service (Heb. 13 : 23). Thus by the use of external evidence only we are carried back to the period of Paul's own companions and helpers as that in which these great epistles were current, which profess to be written by him, and were received as his by the churches which had known him face to face.

Internal evidence gives even more decisive evidence in the case of Galatians. We have seen above how the language, style, and theological standpoint compel its ascription to the same author as the epistles to Rome and Corinth. Until very recent times its whole aspect and content, together with its tone of ardent sincerity, protected it from the faintest whisper of suspicion. Even the sweeping proscrip-

<sup>1</sup> Jn. 1 : 11-13; 3 : 5-8.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Pt. 1 : 23-25. The thought is reproduced from 1 Peter in Jas. 1 : 1, 11, 18, but the Epistle of James is usually regarded as later.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. 10 : 30 quotes Dt. 32 : 35 in the exact form of Rom. 12 : 10 which is not that of the Septuagint. All the other quotations of Hebrews are very exact transcriptions of the Septuagint.

tions of the radical school of Baur at Tübingen left the authenticity of Galatians, Romans, and the two Epistles to the Corinthians unchallenged. In fact, the sense of tremendous earnestness and reality suffused from its pages makes it difficult to do real justice to the minute and learned criticism of a few scholars who reject the Pauline authorship. To the great majority of scholars this criticism represents only a galvanizing into ephemeral activity of the long defunct opposition of Bruno Bauer; but since it is advanced by some serious investigators it is not right to dismiss it unheard.

Necessarily this criticism is accompanied by a corresponding treatment as later and unauthentic of all the writings of the sub-apostolic age already enumerated (*i.e.*, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp) as employing the great Pauline Epistles, leaving nothing to the "Apostolic age" as a really contemporary document save the Diary incorporated by the author of Acts as one of his sources in portions of Acts 16 : 10-28 : 16.

But even the ultra-critics will not deny to that same sub-apostolic age to which Galatians is attributed a reverence for the memory of the apostles, and especially of Peter, which verges on idolatry. In the book of Acts itself, which the hypercritics regard as representing the currently accepted views of the Church regarding the apostles in the period of their pseudo-Paul, both Peter (Acts 10 : 25-26) and Paul (Acts 14 : 11-15, 28 : 6) must deprecate divine honors. But little later a Clement of Rome (*Cor.* v and xlvi) and an Ignatius (*Magnesians*, vii. 1, xiii. 1; *Romans*, iv. 3) regard the utterance of an Apostle as for all practical purposes equivalent to the voice of God! With all possible concessions to the ingenuity and learning of the Dutch school, surely common sense must revolt at the idea that *this* age both produced and adopted into unquestioning circulation a spurious writing which represented Paul as rebuking Peter publicly to his face, and as imputing to him both cowardice and "hypocrisy"! We have, indeed,

## INTRODUCTION

---

instances in plenty of the acceptance by the Church of pseudonymous documents. Those attributed to Peter are instances, with one possible exception. But we have yet to hear of a pseudonymous writing in antagonism to the accepted and cherished beliefs of the Church obtaining even temporary currency without the hue and cry of vehement denunciation.

We are told that the Pauline Epistles were the products of a local faction of the Church. Galatians represents the beginning (*ca.* 130 A.D.) of that anti-Jewish ultra-Paulinism which in less than a score of years produced the tremendous schism of Marcion, almost dividing the Church in half.

We are willing to believe that with Paul as with some other men the *suaviter in modo* yielded when he laid hold of the pen to the *fortiter in re*, so that it was only the later age, an age which came to know him through his writings rather than his personality, which appreciated at its full width the chasm which separates him from the Galilean apostles. A certain rekindling of the old flame of controversy of the days of the first Gentile missions might thus come from the glowing embers of Paul's "literary remains," when these came to be more widely known. It might produce — it did produce in 140–160 A.D. — on the one side a Marcion to out-Paul Paul, on the other a church father as timid in the use of the Pauline Epistles as Justin Martyr, Marcion's contemporary and antagonist.<sup>1</sup> But there are some things that a later than the great missionary age of the outpouring of the Spirit could not produce. One of these is a second great Apostle of the Gentiles to be the Pseudo-Paul of the letters. A second is a repetition of the historical conditions under which the propaganda of cir-

<sup>1</sup> Our only writings from Justin are directed to the defence of Christianity against outsiders. In his *Apologies*, addressed to the Emperor, he of course referred to "the memoirs of the (Galilean) Apostles" rather than to the doctrinal writings of Paul as authority. In his *Dialogue against Trypho the Jew* he would have even less occasion to appeal to Paul. His argument passes from the predictions of the prophets to the fulfilment of them in the life of Jesus, as described in the "memoirs." Had we Justin's treatise against Marcion we should doubtless learn what he thought of Paul, on whose doctrines Marcion so largely depends.

cumcision(!) and “the yoke of the law” could become a real peril to Gentile-Christian churches. A third is an orthodoxy so pusillanimous as to receive without protest at the hands of a Marcion, as authentic letters of Paul, a set of spurious documents expressly framed to contradict the older, better grounded, more widely prevalent representation of its own book of Acts, whose author himself, on this theory, would have been a contemporary of the forger!

#### IV. RELATION TO THE STORY OF PAUL IN ACTS

Since the opponents of the authenticity of the greater Pauline Epistles have taken their stand upon the narrative of Acts, and regard Galatians as belonging to a period even later than that narrative in its present form, we may appropriately consider at this point a question which in any event would be vital, and is particularly unavoidable in the case of this Epistle, viz. What is the respective viewpoint of Galatians and Acts? What is the real measure of difference between the two writers, and the relative degree of credence assignable to the course of events as related by the one and inferred from the other?

As much as possible the work of the individual commentator must be prevented from overlapping that of his fellow-worker in adjacent fields; but in the case of Galatians and Acts some overlapping is unavoidable. Both are concerned in a considerable part of their contents with the same vitally important events, and both, to a greater degree than is commonly realized, treat of those events in an interest which is fundamentally the same, viz. the vindication of Paul’s apostleship and gospel; though, as we shall see, these are really conceived in widely different senses.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that while the book of Acts as a whole is almost forty years later in date<sup>1</sup> than the great Epistles, and unmistakably reflects that strongly idealizing tendency of the post-apostolic age to which we

<sup>1</sup> Gilbert, *Acts (Bible for Home and School, p. 31)*, 70-90 A.D.

have already referred, its compiler has employed throughout the portion dealing with Paul's later career a source, limited indeed in extent but of almost incomparable value, the so-called "Diary" of Paul's companion in travel of Acts 16:10-18; 20:5-15; 21:1-18; and 27:1-28:16. Whether it be Luke himself, that one among the known companions of Paul most plausibly to be identified with this unknown diarist; or be it some later historian who has combined the Diary with other sources relating to the origins of the greater churches, and has given to the compilation its present development and rhetorical finish; at all events the author is mainly concerned with the same great conflict of the apostolic age which engages the pen of Paul, the conflict through which Christianity threw off the swathing bands of Judaism, and became conscious of itself as a world religion. Not alone the central portion of the book (cc. 13-15) is occupied with the raising and settlement of the great question to what extent, if at all, the "yoke of the law" should be considered binding on Gentile converts; the earlier portion as well, which has Peter as its leading character, also culminates in a settlement of this question (in principle), by apostolic conclave in Jerusalem (Acts 10:1-11:18). The later portion, having Paul as its chief actor, and as its subject the peaceful and triumphant progress of Gentile missions, starts from the account of its settlement (in practice) by the second apostolic conclave in Jerusalem (c. 15). It centers upon the story of still a third conclave (21:17-26), whereat Paul meets in Jerusalem the leaders of Jewish Christian conservatism under the leadership of James, and establishes to their entire satisfaction the falsity of the charge that he had taught "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" to disregard the Mosaic law.<sup>1</sup> The book concludes with the establishment of free and untrammelled Gentile Christianity (as Luke understands the terms) at Rome.

<sup>1</sup> The present writer's views of the theological standpoint of the author of Luke-Acts, which is a much more conservative standpoint than that of Mark, or of the source embodied in Acts 10:1-11:18, differ to some extent from those of Professor

Perhaps it is too much to expect that even a personal adherent and ardent devotee of Paul should have so clear a conception of Paul's own attitude regarding his apostleship and gospel as not to yield more or less, when writing the story of Christianity's triumph over Judaism some twenty-five years after Paul's death, to the spell of later veneration for the personal followers of Jesus. In any case the evidences of "idealization" are admittedly abundant in the Lukan story. Its author is convinced that the solution accepted in his own time and environment had been from the outset revealed to the twelve Apostles commissioned by the Lord to the work of evangelizing the world (Lk. 24 : 47-49; Acts 1 : 8; 11 : 1-18; 17: 22-29). This leaves, of course, no room for any serious disagreement between Paul and Peter, James, or any other of the apostolic circle. All the painful and momentous breach with Peter at Antioch so vividly described by Paul (Gal. 2 : 11-21), all the years of storm and stress (the very years of Luke's companionship), during which Paul was battling almost single-handed for the gospel of freedom from the law for Jew and Gentile alike, wrestling in the agonies of a second childbirth (Gal. 4 : 19) against the reenslavement of his Gentile converts under the Jewish Christian's "yoke of bondage," Luke makes to disappear. There are no serious opponents save the wicked Jews. On the contrary, when the work of the church in Antioch, carried on in Gentile territory through its missionaries ("apostles," Acts 14 : 4, 14) "Barnabas and Paul," at first encounters opposition at the hands of certain unauthorized "troublers" (Acts 15 : 1, 24), the opposition is immediately quelled when brought to the attention of the Twelve by their authoritative declaration of God's special revelation to Peter of his approval of similar work (Acts 15 : 7). Paul on his part, as we have seen, readily silences the subsequent complaint that he has taught the

Gilbert in the companion volume of this series. They are made sufficiently clear in two articles recently published in *The American Journal of Theology* entitled respectively "Acts versus Galatians, the Crux of Apostolic History" (July, 1907), and "Harnack and the Lukan Narrative" (January, 1909).

(unevangelized) Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses. He does so by a public act undertaken at Jerusalem for the express purpose of proving that in his methods he has followed loyally and consistently the rules prescribed by "the apostles and elders at Jerusalem." "All shall know," says James, "that there is no truth in the things whereof they (the believing Jews zealous for the law) have been informed concerning thee, but that thou thyself walkest orderly, keeping the law." And Paul acquiesces and undertakes the proof!<sup>1</sup> The implications of Luke here and elsewhere are clear and unmistakeable, and reveal to us how he understood Paul's gospel of "justification apart from works of the law." It applied to Gentiles, *but not to Jews!* The latter, including even "Jews which are among the Gentiles," must continue to circumcise their children,<sup>2</sup> and to "walk after the customs." So far from Peter, or even Paul himself, being under obligation to forego their Jewish scruples and "eat with the Gentiles" when among "those that are without the law" (Gal. 2 : 11-21; 1 Cor. 9 : 20-22), it is the Gentiles who are under obligation to make such concessions as are "necessary" to meet the scruples of their Jewish fellow-believers; because "in every city" they hear Moses "read in the synagogues every Sabbath" (Acts 15 : 21-29).<sup>3</sup> Nay, Luke goes even beyond this. He thinks that Paul himself personally set the example to all "Jews which are among the Gentiles" of "walking orderly, keeping the law." So far from insisting that Peter and Barnabas and "the rest of the Jews" when among Gentiles should renounce their Mosaic scruples, he himself took formal part in the nazirite ceremonial in the temple on a great and critical occasion on purpose to prove that all reports to the contrary notwithstanding he, Paul, *even when among Gentiles*,

<sup>1</sup> Acts 21 : 24-26.

<sup>2</sup> The case of Timothy in Galatia is related as a precedent on this very point. Acts 16 : 1-3. Paul's refusal to circumcise Titus, intended as a precedent on the other side (Gal. 2 : 1-3), is passed over in silence.

<sup>3</sup> On the intention of the Jerusalem "decrees" see below p. 66 and Appended Note B.

set the example to the Jews of "walking orderly, keeping the law!"<sup>1</sup>

So with the other matter so vital to Paul, the independence of his apostleship, and its parity as "an apostleship to the Gentiles" with Peter's as "an apostleship to the circumcision."<sup>2</sup> Luke is committed to the view that the evangelization of the Gentiles was the original commission of Jesus to the Twelve.<sup>3</sup> More particularly the definite direction to begin the work was given, he declares, by special divine revelation to *Peter* when the time was fully ripe;<sup>4</sup> so that Peter can subsequently declare in the very presence of Paul, before the assembled church, "Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among you that by *my mouth* the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe."<sup>5</sup> Peter being thus the real Apostle to the Gentiles, there is no room for Paul save as a practical agent, "a chosen vessel to bear" the message "before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel." Moreover, this practical activity of Paul Luke cannot permit to anticipate the precedent established by Peter. It must be deferred until as missionary agent ("apostle") of the church in Antioch, along with, and at first in subordination to Barnabas, Paul accomplishes "the work whereunto" God had "called him."<sup>6</sup> Such an independent missionary activity as Paul himself describes, making its very beginning among the Gentiles,<sup>7</sup> creating its own precedents, is simply inadmissible on Luke's theory. Luke is compelled, from his general assumption, to think of Paul's earlier Christian career as spent among Jewish believers in subordination to and in dependence on the apostles and Barnabas.<sup>8</sup> He describes it as

<sup>1</sup> Acts 21:20-26. Cf. Gal. 2:11-21.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. 2:8.

<sup>3</sup> Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:8.

<sup>4</sup> Acts 9:32-11:18. In the source this section probably came *after* c. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Acts 15:7.

<sup>6</sup> Acts 13:1-3; cf. 9:15, 26-30.

<sup>7</sup> Gal. 1:10-24.

<sup>8</sup> Acts 9:22-30; 11:19-26. In the latter passage (ver. 20) an original "Greeks" has been altered by Luke to "Grecian Jews" (on the question of text see Warfield, *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* III, p. 113-137). This change, so clearly against the context, is to avoid the (manifestly historical) representation that Antioch itself was a half Gentile foundation and that the "trouble" of 15:24 alluded to by Paul (Gal. 2:4) was really at this time.

occupied with fruitless endeavors to convert the Greek-speaking *Jews*, first at Damascus, afterwards at Jerusalem, “and in all the country of *Judæa*” (Acts 9 : 22, 28–30; 22 : 17–21; 26 : 20). When he is “sent away to Tarsus” to escape Jewish hostility, not a word is said about his preaching there. Only after a second intervention of Barnabas, and by special revelation of the Spirit, does Paul find at last his life-work. This is that he should be the great foreign missionary of the church of Antioch (Acts 11 : 19–26; 13 : 1–3); but even then at the start as subordinate to Barnabas. The visit to Jerusalem with Barnabas has no relation to Paul’s missionary activity. It is not made that he and Barnabas may secure freedom to work in their own province unmolested. It is not made that Paul “may not labor in vain neither run in vain.” Even if the partners take back to Antioch with them from Jerusalem the nephew of Barnabas, who became their minister on the great campaign of Gentile evangelization, this was mere coincidence. The idea of the Gentile mission was a divine revelation, but it came later.

The question whether so fundamental a difference in view-point on such vital questions as those of Paul’s apostleship and gospel is compatible with the theory of Lukan authorship of Acts is one which can only be settled by a criticism which is beyond our present province. But on any theory the difference in view-point remains, and cannot be ignored in any attempt, such as we have now to make, to reconstruct the historical background of the Epistle to the Galatians. Disagreement with Acts, as we have seen, cannot militate against the authenticity of the great Pauline Epistles. It may compel us to exercise considerable caution in adopting the statements of Acts specially affected by this view-point. In short we are obliged to use with utmost respect the data afforded by this our one historical source; yet we must insist upon discrimination between the more trustworthy and the less, and are now aware of certain general preconceptions which decidedly affect

Luke's representation, particularly as regards Paul's earlier career, and his relations to the Twelve.<sup>1</sup>

## V. TO WHOM GALATIANS WAS WRITTEN

From the very subject of Acts, which aims to vindicate Paul's evangelization of the Gentile world by setting his career in parallelism with that of Peter, though on a lower plane, we should anticipate in its pages a specially full account of the founding and development of "the churches of Galatia," which from Paul's letter appear to have afforded the chief battle-ground in the attempt to subject Gentile believers to "the yoke of the law." And in point of fact in Acts the story of the four great churches of (Pisidian) Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra is related with very exceptional fulness. We have first two long chapters (cc. 13-14) descriptive of the First Missionary Journey and its results, wherein their founding is the main matter. This leads over to the story (c. 15) how delegates of the church in Antioch, on whose initiative the missionary campaign had been undertaken, went up to Jerusalem and obtained from a solemn conclave of "the apostles and elders" a sort of magna charta, endorsing the work, and limiting to four "necessary things" the obligations which might be imposed upon Gentile converts from the side of Judaism. Thirdly and finally the succeeding section (Acts 15:30-16:6) relates how the two great Gentile districts thus evangelized by Barnabas and Paul, Cyprus, and trans-Cilician Asia Minor, were revisited and established on the basis of the settlement effected in Jerusalem. Barnabas with Mark now returned to Cyprus, his native province, while Paul with Silas returned to Derbe and Lystra and the other trans-Taurus cities. Luke adds: "And as they went on their way through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, which had been ordained of the apostles and elders

<sup>1</sup> On Luke's transfer of the Conference of Barnabas and Paul with the Pillars at Jerusalem from just before (Acts 11:10-30; 12:25) to just after the First Missionary Journey (Acts 11:1-35) see above, p. 15, note 8, and Appended Note B.

that were at Jerusalem." Thus he concludes his account of how the systematic evangelization of the Gentile world was begun, and how it was endorsed and regulated by "the apostles and elders in Jerusalem."

1. *The Churches of Galatia.* — From Acts 16:6 Luke begins the account of the so-called Second Missionary Journey, an (independent) missionary enterprise of Paul and Silas, which resulted in the evangelization of both coasts of the *Æ*gean (Acts 16:6-18:23). The story of the conquest of this new territory begins with a temporarily frustrated attempt to enter the province of (proconsular) Asia. The missionaries "passed through the region of Galatian Phrygia" in an attempt to enter Bithynia, "because they had been forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia." This is the only occurrence of the term "Galatia" in Acts, with one exception. A similar phrase in inverted order is found in 18:23: "And having spent some time (in Syrian Antioch) he departed, and went through the region of Galatia and (through) Phrygia in order, establishing all the disciples." It is practically certain that in Acts 18:23 the writer means to include the four great churches of the First Missionary Journey under the term "region of Galatia"; for he is describing a systematic visitation ("in order") for the "establishment" of "all the disciples" between (Syrian) Antioch and Ephesus; and Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and (Pisidian) Antioch lay directly upon the great high road between Syria and Ephesus. As these four cities at the time of Luke's writing had formed part of the Roman province of Galatia for more than a hundred years, and seventy-five or more at the time of Paul's visit, it would be most natural for Luke thus to group them in this general summary, although in the more detailed account of their founding (cc. 13, 14) he designates them in accordance with their ethnic character as "cities of Lycaonia" and "Pisidia," notwithstanding these former territorial divisions no longer had existence on the Roman map. If so, the region designated "Phrygo-Galatic region"

or “region of Galatian Phrygia” in 16 : 6 is referred to in the subsequent more summary account of 18 : 23 not as “Galatia,” but simply “Phrygia.”

It thus appears that the only portion of the province of Galatia ever entered by Paul according to Acts is “South Galatia,” for the phrase “Phrygo-Galatic” in Acts 16 : 6 expressly distinguishes this “region” from Galatia strictly so called.<sup>1</sup> But in the third century “South Galatia” in the process of Roman redefinition of provincial frontiers was again excluded from “Galatia,” and, whether at the same period or later, Acts 16 : 6 was altered to read “passed through the regions of Galatia *and* Phrygia.” It was quite inevitable that the church fathers should assume after this that “the churches of Galatia” were founded on this (supposed) journey to “Galatia,” and the majority of modern commentators, though rejecting the reading, still hold to this view.

What, then, is Luke’s meaning in Acts 16 : 6-10? It is clear from the formal wind-up of his whole account of the “trouble” about the churches founded on the First Missionary Journey in Acts 16 : 5, that “South Galatia” is now left behind. After the settlement, wherein the essential features are the circumcision of Timothy in Lystra, and the distribution of the “decrees,” Luke advances with ver. 6 to the new campaign on unevangelized territory. “Asia,” that is Ephesus and its adjacent district, had been the strategic objective; but for some reason, perhaps the same which later made Paul hesitate to remain there although urgently entreated (Acts 18 : 20), a reason which may readily be guessed from Rom. 15 : 20-22 (cf. Acts 19 : 1), the missionaries at their last station of Christianized territory (Pisidian Antioch?) were turned from their course by a “revelation” conveyed through the (local?) prophets. For this reason they turned due north and “passed through the region of Galatian Phrygia.” This region, now “traversed” by Paul

<sup>1</sup> “The term Galactic excludes Galatia in the narrow sense; and Acts 16 : 6 when taken according to contemporary usage asserts that Paul did not traverse North Galatia.”—Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 81.

with Silas and Timothy between Pisidian Antioch and an unnamed point “over against Mysia” in their attempt to “go into Bithynia,” lay therefore on the very border between “Asia” and Galatia, and had in older times formed part of “Phrygia.”

The missionaries “passed through” Phrygia Galatica as Peter was entreated to “pass through” *without delay* to the help of the disciples in Joppa.<sup>1</sup> Either Luke, whether through ignorance or design, had nothing to tell about the founding of “the churches of Galatia” and their relation to the historic controversy wherein Paul’s championship of their cause secured the truth of the gospel to the whole Gentile world (Gal. 2:5); or else he understands by them the ethnically diverse churches of Southern Galatia whose evangelization and subsequent “establishment” he relates with such exceptional fulness and interest in 13:13-14:28; 15:30-16:5 and 18:23. Only in connection with these cities of Pisidia, Phrygia, and Lycaonia have we any clear intimation from Acts that Paul ever entered the province of Galatia.

2. *The North Galatian Theory.* — But many recent authorities still think it impossible to relinquish the North Galatian theory. The great commentator Lightfoot found evidence of Celtic blood (!) in the “fickleness” displayed by Paul’s converts in so soon forsaking his gospel (Gal. 1:6). But had the Galatians displayed all the volatility which the typical Englishman imagines to be characteristic of the typical Frenchman, they could hardly have surpassed in fickleness the Lycaonians of Lystra, who were first for worshipping Paul, and in a twinkling, under the influence of “Jews from Antioch and Iconium,” attempted to stone him to death (Acts 13:8-19).

Other arguments for the North Galatian theory have more weight to-day, especially with German scholars. For while it is difficult to suppose that an author with the aims and interests of Luke would have been silent as to the founding of “the churches of Galatia” so prominent in the Epistles,

<sup>1</sup> Acts 9:38 (Greek).

there is an undeniable advantage in debate to the contestant who can take refuge in our ignorance. As we know nothing whatever about the evangelization of North Galatia, which does not so much as come within the purview of ecclesiastical writers until about 170 A.D., it is impossible to say that any of the occurrences implied in Paul's allusions to his "former" and latter visits among the "Galatians" could not have taken place there. The most recent and one of the most eminent of German commentators even finds it "fatal" to the South Galatian theory that whereas according to Gal. 4:13 ff. Paul was detained among the Galatians by illness, and so engaged in their evangelization, we have in Acts 13-14 no intimation of any illness of Paul, while in Acts 16:6 f. we are told that Paul was "forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia."<sup>1</sup> We will not adopt the sarcasm of R. Steck, who inquires whether then we are to identify "the Holy Ghost" with Paul's "messenger of Satan sent to buffet him";<sup>2</sup> but we may at least point out that illness is certainly *not* the cause of the turning aside on the *Second* Missionary Journey; whereas the similar turning back at almost the identical spot on the *First* Missionary Journey (Acts 13:51) might very well be due to illness. Acts is simply silent as to the reason why Paul and Barnabas go first to the extreme western limit of Galatian territory, and then, when driven from Pisidian Antioch, return to its nearer cities, instead of continuing on the road to the cities of "Asia." Illness might well account for this seeming halt and retreat. The case of the flank movement of Acts 16:6 is different. Here the reason is distinctly implied. The intervention of "the Holy Spirit" meets the crying need of "Macedonia" (ver. 9-10). If one interjects a campaign in Galatia this motive is frustrated. And even were we to suppose an illness, of which there is not the slightest intimation, no treatment could possibly be so improbable as the undertaking of a new and arduous missionary campaign

<sup>1</sup> Bousset in J. Weiss' *Schriften des neuen Testaments*, 1908, II, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> In 2 Cor. 12:5-10 Paul's "weakness" (Gr. "illness") is so described.

## INTRODUCTION

---

across the half barbarous wilds of northern Galatia, among an alien race speaking an unknown tongue.

Besides this, we know from Paul's letters that for years before his final visit to Jerusalem he had been engaged in a work of gathering contributions among his Gentile converts "for the poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem" (Rom. 15:25-31). The "churches of Galatia" were among the first to engage in this work (1 Cor. 16:1) which seems to have been undertaken in fulfilment of Paul's pledge to the "Pillars" in Jerusalem, shortly before the rupture with Peter at Antioch (Gal. 2:10, 11 ff.). In the great gathering of delegates assembled at Troas to make the journey with Paul in Acts 20:4, in which as a rule each of the great provincial churches of Paul's missionary field seems to have been represented by two "messengers" (cf. 2 Cor. 8-9), it is extremely improbable that "the churches of Galatia" should have been unrepresented. If the North Galatian theory be true, no name is given which can belong to their representatives. *Two* names, however, will be left over with no group of churches to represent. They will be "Gaius of Derbe" and "Timothy of Lystra."

If "the churches of Galatia" be not found in the comparatively well-Hellenized cities of Derbe and Lystra, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch, on the great high road from Syria to "Asia," but in unknown cities of the remote highlands of the original Galatia, we shall encounter another perplexity. In Paul's case the enthusiasm of the cross would doubtless triumph, even in the face of physical "weakness," against all deterrents of the most arduous and unpromising field of labor. *If* the field toward which in the intention of Luke in Acts 16:6-8 Paul is being "driven by the Spirit" is really the virgin soil of Galatia, and not Macedonia ripe for the harvest, we may be sure that Paul would have gone, in spite of all we know of his "eye for strategic points." But what of the Judaizers? Thessalonica and Philippi seem to have remained too remote from the headquarters of these propagandists to be reached by them. Rome itself

was not seriously affected. But the North Galatian theory requires us to assume that these reactionaries, who could not hope for success save where a considerable Jewish element formed the nucleus of the church, *passed by* the flourishing Pauline mission field of Lycaonian and Pisidian Galatia, leaving unmolested the churches formed out of the “synagogues” (Acts 13:14, 15; 14:1, 2) of Iconium and Pisidian Antioch, neglecting Derbe and Lystra and “the Jews that were in those parts” (Acts 14:19; 16:3), for the uninviting task of reconverting to Mosaism (!) Paul’s barbarian converts in Celtic Galatia. This seems hardly probable, if the motives of the Judaizers were such as Paul describes (Gal. 6:12, 13).

Other objections to the North Galatian theory perhaps as serious as those already instanced spring from the later relative dating which it involves. In Gal. 4:13 Paul implies that he had been twice among the Galatians.<sup>1</sup> Unless Acts 13-14 can be the first visit and Acts 15:30-16:5 the second, this compels a dating of the letter subsequent to the establishment of Paul’s headquarters in Ephesus (Acts 19:10). It is true that Paul returned to Greece shortly before writing 2 Corinthians; but so late as this the appearance of the Judaizers in Galatia could hardly be the surprise to Paul which the Epistle implies, nor the events of Gal. 2 unknown to the churches. If on the other hand we date Galatians during the period of his residence in “Asia,” the cry of 4:20, “Would that I could be present with you now,” becomes difficult to explain. One asks, “Well, if he be no further off than Ephesus, still more if he be in Antioch (Acts 18:23) on the point of a journey through these very regions, why in the world does he not go?” An early date with remoteness from Galatia can only be found in the Second Missionary Journey before Paul’s departure from Corinth (Acts 18:18).

<sup>1</sup> See note *ad loc.* Some think to avoid the implication by rendering *to proteron* “formerly,” instead of “the former time.” But it is the presence of the distinguishing adverb, however rendered, that proves the point.

3. *The Pauline Geography.* — If against the attempts to adjust the implications of Paul's letter to the story of Acts by the interjection of supposititious journeys to North Galatia, we set the fact, demonstrable by the simple use of the Greek concordance, that Paul and Luke differ in their use of geographical terms, the difficulties disappear, and it becomes apparent at once that those whom Paul addresses as "Galatians" (Gal. 1:2; 3:1) are no other than the churches which Luke describes as founded in Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium of Phrygia, and Derbe and Lystra of Lycania. Paul, who invariably employs the terminology of the official Roman geography,<sup>1</sup> could have found no other common term to address them. To have called them "Phrygians" would have been insulting.<sup>2</sup> Many were Jews, some were Romans. All would take most satisfaction in being called "Galatians."

Even Luke, as we have seen, when he wishes to speak of all four churches as a group, refers to them as "the disciples of the region of Galatia" (Acts 18:23). Why then does he not so describe them in cc. 13-14? In speaking of the fortunes of "the apostles Barnabas and Saul," and how they were affected in passing from one to another of these cities, with their differing speech,<sup>3</sup> differing customs and beliefs, different government or proportion of Jewish influence, Luke gives them the ethnic name indicative of these differences. In like manner in 16:6 he speaks of the border region between official "Asia" and "Galatia" as "the Phrygo-Galatic region"; not because he aims at accuracy as a historical geographer, and knows that this territory had once belonged to Phrygia, though now incorporated in "Galatia," but because he knows the experiences of the travellers, and that they passed through a region where the

<sup>1</sup> Paul speaks, like the Roman citizen that he was, of "Achaia" (Rom. 15:26; 1 Cor. 16:15; etc.), "Macedonia" (1 Cor. 16:5; 2 Cor. 1:16; etc.), "Asia" (1 Cor. 16:10; 2 Cor. 1:8; etc.), "Illyria" (Rom. 15:10), or "Dalmatia" (2 Tim. 4:10), "Judaea" (i.e. Palestine, Gal. 1:22; 1 Thess. 2:14; etc.), "Arabia" (Gal. 1:17; 4:25). Even had he not been a Roman born it would be more natural for the campaign leader to use the language of the map.

<sup>2</sup> "Phrygian" was equivalent to "slave."

<sup>3</sup> Acts 14:11.

people whom they met spoke the Phrygian language and wore the Phrygian cap, while at the same time one could see not infrequently the big-boned, fair-haired Gaul, striding about in his uncouth garb and weapons, and talking his outlandish jargon. Ethnically, and for that which strikes the traveller, the region was "Phrygo-Galactic" (16:6). But when Luke has occasion later to mention the disciples of this district as a whole, they are simply those of "Phrygia" (18:23). In Lystra they used "the speech of Lycaonia" (14:11).

Since Pliny, Tacitus, and Ptolemy all speak of the heterogeneous elements combined under Galatian sovereignty as "Galatia," and since Iconium itself in one of its own inscriptions of the first century A.D. is said to be "of the province of Galatia," we could not expect Paul to refer to the churches of Acts 13-14 in any other way than as "churches of Galatia." Until the more northerly region of the province was evangelized, which so far as we know did not take place before 200 A.D., they would be "*the* churches of Galatia." Indeed we have reason to think they long continued to be so called. The second century romance of *Paul and Thekla* does not indeed employ the collective term, but only shows that the individual cities were still remembered as one of Paul's great mission fields. But in the reign of Domitian (81-95 A.D.) a Paulinist, writing under the pseudonym of "Peter," addresses comprehensively the Christians of all Asia Minor. As he has no other term under which the great churches of the First Missionary Journey can be included, we have either a most unaccountable omission, or else this author too includes the Pisidian and Lycaonian Christians under the head "the elect of the dispersion who are sojourners in . . . Galatia."<sup>1</sup>

## VI. DATE AND OCCASION OF THE LETTER

If we may now regard it as reasonably established that "the churches of Galatia" were those whose foundation is

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. 1:1.

related in Acts 13-14, we may properly look for some degree of correspondence between the allusions of the letter and the story as related by Luke.

We have seen already that Gal. 4 : 13-20 implies that Paul had been among them on two previous occasions, and that at the time of writing some insuperable obstacle, so self-evident that he does not need to explain its nature, makes his coming to them impracticable. These data, meagre as they are, suffice to establish a probable situation for the Apostle at the time of writing. Paul is probably separated from them by the broad gulf of the Ægean.

1. *Relation of Galatians to Romans.*—So excellent a critic as Adeney,<sup>1</sup> who accepts this geographical inference, argues, however, as Lightfoot did, from the close interrelation of Galatians with Romans that it was written, like Romans, from Corinth, and but shortly before Romans itself.

We have seen<sup>2</sup> that theories which regard Antioch or Ephesus as the place of writing are improbable, and for the most part are mere inferences from the dates adopted by their advocates. But the relation of Galatians to Romans is a fact not so lightly to be dismissed as is liable to be the case when one regards it as a mere matter of style and vocabulary. It is something much more far-reaching than this, which could be easily accounted for in epistles separated by the interval even of half a decade by similarity of occasion and subject-matter. It is a relation much slighter in degree, but similar to that which subsists between Ephesians and Colossians, a tendency to revert to the same arguments, the same data and illustrations, to prove the same points, in language which here and there falls into even identical phrases.<sup>3</sup>

Among the opponents of Pauline authorship this relation is considered a phenomenon of fundamental importance. To Steck it is the foundation stone of his argument for the

<sup>1</sup> Century Bible, *Thessalonians and Galatians*, by W. F. Adeney, 1907 (?) (no date), pp. 87-97.

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 23. See also Adeney, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-97.

<sup>3</sup> For parallel phrases see Adeney, *ibid.*, p. 91 f.

literary dependence of Galatians on Romans and Acts. Galatians, we are told, would be unintelligible to readers unacquainted with the fuller form of the Pauline argument set forth in Romans. But surely this is precisely what the conditions as usually understood should lead us to expect. Galatians was written to converts who on two previous occasions had heard the exposition of Paul's "gospel"; Romans, to converts who only knew of it by hearsay. Galatians was written in the violent agitation of intense polemic; Romans, as a calm and reasoned exposition of Paul's complete doctrine. Why should not Romans complete the gaps and fill the leaps of logic in the shorter epistle? We are not surprised to find great differences on this question of priority among the ultra-critics themselves, while not only conservatives such as Lightfoot and Adeney take the fuller, more closely reasoned form of the argument as the later; but the ultra-critics themselves, Steck and Van Manen in the lead, free-lances like Völter and Spitta ardently espousing the cause, are eager to prove to us that Romans itself is a composite, of which portions might well be earlier and portions later than Galatians.<sup>1</sup> In short, such a relation *does* subsist in some degree as between Colossians and Ephesians, and the ultra-critics are simply ringing the changes on the intricate theory of a much greater scholar,<sup>2</sup> elaborated to fit these phenomena in the case of Ephesians and Colossians. But Holtzmann's theory of Ephesians and Colossians as mutually related elaborations of a Pauline substructure remains unconvincing even to critics of his own school and following. Still more unconvincing must be the far weaker case of Galatians and Romans. The real explanation is much simpler. The same writer on similar occasions will always tend to repeat himself. If the subject-matter be something which his very occupation compels him to constantly reiterate, he will repeat even

<sup>1</sup> See the article *s.v.* "Romans" in *Encycl. Bibl.*, by Van Manen, with the earlier authorities cited.

<sup>2</sup> H. J. Holtzmann, *Kritik der Epheser und Colosserbriefe*, 1872.

whole phrases in identical, or very closely similar language. So with Paul. The phenomenon is not confined to Ephesians and Colossians, nor to Galatians and Romans. The figure of 1 Thess. 5 : 4-10 of the sons of light, clad in armor and waiting for the great Captain of their deliverance, derived from Is. 59 : 17, probably through the mediation of an Isaian apocalypse quoted in Eph. 5 : 14,<sup>1</sup> recurs both in Rom. 13 : 12 and in Eph. 5 : 9. Paul was beyond question the most creative mind among all the missionaries of the new propaganda. But we have no need to exaggerate his originality in the face of his own statements regarding the common element in "the preaching of the cross."<sup>2</sup> When we compare his own references to his regular type of missionary preaching in 1 Thess. 1 : 9, 10 with Luke's report of it in Acts 14 : 15-17; 17 : 24-31, and this in turn with Rom. 1 : 18-2 : 16 on the one hand and a whole series of Jewish and Christian *kerygmas*, extending from Pseudo-Aristeas and the Wisdom of Solomon, through the *Preaching of Peter* down to Aristides, Tatian, *ad Diognetum*, and Athenagoras, we see that there was a regular type corresponding to the *diatribe* of the Stoic and Cynic street preachers. And Paul is not superior to using such forms, just as Luke assumes that he would. If this be true regarding the most general themes of missionary proclamation, how much more might we expect that renewed occasion for setting forth the nature and grounds of his gospel of "justification apart from works of the law" would lead Paul to revert in Romans once and again to the line of argument pursued against the Judaizers in Galatia, albeit, for the reason above stated, with more careful attention to the logical nexus.

With this answer to the opponents of the authenticity we have already answered those who find it hard to believe that the Corinthian correspondence, and perhaps even the Thessalonian as well, could have intervened between Galatians and Romans. In neither case was there any such

<sup>1</sup> See Bacon, *Story of St. Paul*, 1904, p. 341 ff.      <sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. 15 : 11.

occasion as in Romans for a recapitulation of Paul's system, as against Jewish Christian misrepresentation. The Judaizers do not seem ever to have reached Macedonia. In Corinth the issues were drawn upon other, less theoretical, lines. It was not so much a matter of the doctrine of justification by faith and the obligation of the law, as of local contentions and of Paul's personal authority. To forestall misrepresentation in Rome Paul felt obliged to present a full statement of his doctrinal system. Considering the line his opponents could not fail to take, it is not surprising that even a later letter should show more resemblance in its doctrinal argument to Galatians than to the Thessalonian or even the Corinthian letters.

2. *Internal Indications.* — If then neither the references of Acts to Paul's "Galatian" journeys, nor the connection of Galatians with Romans oblige us to bring down its date to Paul's second journey down the Greek peninsula, we may well turn to the Epistle itself for such intimations of conditions whether of writer or recipients as will tend to fix its date and occasion.

It has been already intimated<sup>1</sup> that the indignant surprise of Paul on learning of the nefarious work of the Judaizers among his Galatian converts is hard to reconcile with the idea that he had already passed through the extremely trying experiences occasioned by their inroads in the remoter field of Corinth. Also that the necessity Paul seems to be under of relating the true history of his understanding with the "pillars" at Jerusalem, and subsequent misunderstanding with Peter, Barnabas, and "the rest of the Jews" at Antioch, together with the extreme harshness of his characterization of their conduct, are opposed to the idea that our Epistle dates from so long an interval thereafter. Some five or six years later we find Paul pointing with approval to the example of "Barnabas" and "Cephas,"<sup>2</sup> and very strenuously urging his "strong" adherents both in Corinth and Rome to show more consideration for the

<sup>1</sup> Above, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. 3:22; 9:5.

scruples of the “weak,” who were in dread of contamination by the pollutions of idols. We intimated above the improbability after this of a *renewed* exacerbation of Paul’s feeling toward Peter and Barnabas. We have now to consider whether the allusions of the letter itself, mainly comprised in the appeal of 4 : 12–20 to the Galatians for a return to the cordial relations which had subsisted when Paul “preached the gospel to them the first time,” can enable us to fix upon any particular date and define in any closer way the occasion of the letter.

It appears that the Galatians, or at least the great majority of them, owed their conversion to Paul’s own preaching. He had been their spiritual mother in Christ.<sup>1</sup> Although in 1 : 8 (“we preached”) it is made apparent that his missionary preaching at the time of their evangelization had been, as usual, in company with another, this other cannot be included in the general expression “all the brethren which are with me” of ver. 2. A founder of the Galatian churches themselves would certainly have been distinguished by name, as are “Silvanus and Timothy” in 1 Thess. 1 : 1; 2 Thess. 1 : 1. These latter, companions of the “second missionary journey,” Timothy a native himself of southern Galatia (Acts 16 : 1–3), must also, for the same reason, have been away from Paul’s immediate vicinity at the time of writing.<sup>2</sup> That the former companion in question was Barnabas, Paul’s fellow-“apostle” on the “first missionary journey,” is made probable by the references of 2 : 1, 9, 13, the last of which especially implies some exceptional interest of the Galatians in Barnabas; otherwise there would be no occasion for distinguishing him among the general mass of those “carried away by their [the Judaizers’] hypocrisy.” After this rupture, or at least after the first missionary journey, Barnabas ceased to be Paul’s missionary companion (Acts 15 : 36–41).

In 4 : 13–15 something is told us both of the occasion of Paul’s coming on his “former” tour of evangelization,

<sup>1</sup> 4 : 11, 14, 19.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 48.

and of the nature of his reception. The evangelization of the "Galatians" had not formed part of his original plan of campaign, but had been forced on him by an attack of illness, whose repugnant character might have been expected to deter them from receiving his message. On the contrary they had given him a reception of extraordinary enthusiasm. Demonstrations of an exceptional, perhaps public, character can alone account for the expressions of 4 : 14-15, though Paul does not enable us to determine their exact nature. This enthusiastic beginning, accompanied as it had been by the usual "demonstrations of the Spirit and of power" (3 : 2, 5), had been followed by severe persecution, doubtless instigated by the Jews (3 : 4; cf. 1 Thess. 2 : 14-16). The churches themselves, however, were principally made up of converts from heathenism (4 : 8-10). Some of these, no doubt, had been gleaned from the class of "devout persons," whom the Synagogue habitually attracted in heathen cities by its simple monotheistic teaching, and whose defection was bitterly resented (cf. Acts 18 : 7; 19 : 9). Few, at all events, had adopted the Jewish mode of life, and none can have actually submitted to circumcision at the time of Paul's writing, else the indictment of 4 : 10 would be graver, and the threat of 5 : 2 belated. A considerable element, however, of the original constituency was of actual Jewish descent, or (like Timothy) of mixed blood; for the argument of 3 : 26-29 is clearly directed to the unification on equal terms of both classes. The Jews must have been among the first converts, for after rupture with the Synagogue defection from the Jewish to the Gentile mode of life maintained in the Pauline churches could occur but rarely. The effort in progress on the part of Paul's opponents at the time of writing is an endeavor primarily to reclaim these renegades from the law by "another gospel" (1 : 6, 8-9), which under the name of Christ should preserve the essential features of Jewish particularism. They also aimed, however, to include as many as possible of Paul's converts from heathenism (6 : 13). At Antioch

the reactionary propaganda had already met at least a temporary success (2 : 13).

At the time of Paul's second visit the Galatians had still been "running well" (5 : 7). Yet from the references in 1 : 9; 5 : 3(?), 21, to former warnings against the Judaizing reaction, which would be scarcely appropriate at the first visit, it is probable that Paul had even then had some reason to anticipate the invasion. After the collision in Antioch (2 : 10-21), nullifying, as Paul's opponents would be sure to assume, any obligation upon them of the Jerusalem compact (2 : 9), there would be reason enough for such apprehension; though the indignant surprise expressed in 1 : 6; 3 : 1; 4 : 8-11 shows clearly that at the second visit the interlopers had not yet made their appearance. We may perhaps infer, with Zahn, from the completeness of Paul's information, coupled with entire silence as to its source, that a delegation from the Galatian churches themselves had presented the matter to him in person, not realizing the intensity of opposition the proposals of the newcomers would arouse.

Such are the conditions presupposed by Paul's references to the recent past. They can all be met by the supposition that the Galatian churches are those whose founding is related in the story of the First Missionary Journey (Acts 13-14). Some, such as the references to Barnabas, can be met on no other. They also very strongly suggest that the Epistle was written shortly after Paul's first arrival in Corinth, before Silas and Timothy had come down from Macedonia with the good news which heartened Paul for his great task in that city.<sup>1</sup> If the comparatively unruffled tone of the Thessalonian letters seems to be an obstacle to this view, inasmuch as they would then be later than Galatians, we shall be obliged to suppose that some temporary absence accounts for Paul's failure to include special greetings from them along with his own. It seems more reasonable to account for the altered tone of the Thessa-

<sup>1</sup> Acts 18 : 1-5; 1 Thess. 3 : 6.

lonian correspondence by the relief occasioned by the ready acquiescence of the “brethren” in Paul’s views, and the cheering news brought by Silas and Timothy from Macedonia.<sup>1</sup>

We are not left to mere conjecture in fixing upon the first weeks of Paul’s stay in Corinth as the date of the Galatian letter. As Zahn has pointed out, 1 Thess. 1 : 9 explicitly refers to a “report” which has come echoing back to Paul, from places “not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place.” It related Paul’s own missionary successes in Thessalonica. Such echoes could not be transmitted by wireless telegraphy. They came to Paul in the person of very real and human “messengers of the churches” who could deliver to him not only congratulations on his work, but reports on their own, and on conditions in the home churches. From whence, outside the Greek peninsula, could the echo come to which Paul here refers? Surely from no other region than that of Paul’s own older foundations, where his new successes would be greeted with the rejoicing he implies. And from whom should we most expect the congratulations to come if not from Lystra and Derbe, where Timothy’s mother,<sup>2</sup> and the elders whose ordaining hands had been laid upon his head,<sup>3</sup> would be longing beyond all others for just such news as this? The messengers of the churches whose arrival is implied in 1 Thess. 1 : 9 will be those who brought to Paul the news of Judaizing reaction in Galatia. They may be the “brethren” referred to in Gal. 1 : 1.

3. *The Judaizers and their Success among the Galatians.* — If the church at (Syrian) Antioch remained under the influence of the delegation “from James,”<sup>4</sup> it would be almost unavoidable that attempts should be made, as soon as Paul himself were known to be well out of the way (4 : 18), to prevent the loss of its most promising mission fields. Barnabas, who was the leading man in the Antioch

<sup>1</sup> 1 Thess. 3 : 6; Acts 18 : 1-5.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Tim. 1 : 5, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Acts 16 : 1-3.

<sup>4</sup> Gal. 2 : 12.

church, had himself participated in their conquest, and had now with Peter and "all the rest of the Jews" definitely taken sides against Paul. For ourselves, at least, no other inference is possible from the silence of Gal. 2:11-21 as to the effect of Paul's vehement harangue. He speaks indeed later of Barnabas with respect (1 Cor. 9:6; Col. 4:10), as we have seen, but the separation in spheres of activity seems to have been permanent. We learn, in fact, from Acts 15:39 that Barnabas went to his own portion of the new field formerly traversed in common, Cyprus, which henceforth plays no part among Paul's "churches of the Gentiles." The same relations of respect without contact seem to be implied in Paul's subsequent references to Peter.<sup>1</sup> We have no more trace of any personal intercourse between the two apostles. It is observable, however, that in rebuking the schism at Corinth, where one party vaunt the name "of Peter" against those who claim to be "of Paul," Paul avoids any treatment of the issues between himself and Peter, confining himself to a "transfer of the figure" of the different builders to himself and Apollos (1 Cor. 3:4-4:6). Moreover, the great emphasis laid both in 1 Corinthians and Romans on the duty of avoiding offence to the "weak" brother, by inconsiderate application of the Pauline principle, "All things are lawful," especially in the matter of "distinctions of meats" and the "pollutions of idols," is very noticeable. It can only be for the benefit of Jewish Christians, scrupulous of conscience regarding Sabbaths, holy days, and meats (Rom. 14:2, 5), yet peaceably disposed and not making their scruples a subject for "doubtful disputations." Who are these toward whom Paul shows himself so considerate, if not those who at Corinth claimed to be "of Cephas," and who at Antioch seem to have remained masters of the field?

It is a different type against whom Paul launches the fierce invective of Galatians, Corinthians, and Philippians, denying to them even the name of brethren, calling them

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. 3:22; 9:5.

“spies,” “ministers of Satan disguising themselves as angels of light,” “false apostles,” “super-extra apostles,” intruders in the ready-reaped harvest-fields of others. These intruders he expressly excludes from the farewell blessing of his letter to the Galatians (6 : 16), and even invokes upon them his solemn anathema (1 : 9). Had we Galatians alone we might easily be misled into thinking that Paul classes Peter and Barnabas in this group. Some modern scholars even, who base their views too exclusively on this polemic epistle, seem to imagine that Peter and even Barnabas actually joined in the effort to impose circumcision on Gentile Christians, after having already won the battle of liberty on their behalf in Jerusalem. This would be “hypocrisy” indeed, and not only cowardice, but cowardice without a motive. But the later epistles enable us to discriminate. The Judaizers, even if any of them now came from Antioch into its mission field, were not of Antiochian origin, and did not appeal to its authority. “Those of repute” at Jerusalem were the authority to which they first appealed. Later, it would seem, they appealed to the example of Christ himself “after the flesh” (1 Cor. 1 : 12; 2 Cor. 10 : 7; 5 : 16). It does not appear that they ever claimed the support of Peter, nor even of James after Gal. 2 : 12. They urged that Jesus himself had been a Jew faithful to the law. Paul too, they pointed out, would admit that Christ had been “a minister of the circumcision” (Rom. 15 : 8). In the letter of boasting which his disloyal Corinthian converts compel him to write (2 Cor. 10 : 1 – 13 : 10) to offset the “letters of commendation” which these interlopers displayed, Paul draws their portrait with no gentle hand. They were “Hebrews,” “Israelites,” the “seed of Abraham,” “ministers of Christ.” They stretched themselves to reach out into another’s province. They called themselves “apostles (*i.e.* missionaries) of Christ,” and magnified their authority to take tribute of the churches. The name of “James” is not mentioned. Paul could not bring it in on his own behalf otherwise than

he has done in Gal. 2 : 1-10, until a personal interview with the head of the mother church (Rom. 15 : 30-32; Acts 21 : 18, 19) should clear away mutual misunderstanding. James' death occurred but shortly after (ca. 62 A.D.). Judaizers boasted a higher name (2 Cor. 10 : 7), and perhaps were themselves not altogether sure of the approval of James; for on at least one critical occasion his verdict had been given against them (Gal. 2 : 9). Certainly Paul was hopeful of a good understanding when he "went in unto James" attended by the delegates of his Gentile churches (Acts 21 : 18).

At all events, these false apostles of Christ, and not the representatives of Antioch, Peter or Barnabas, or any of their following, are certainly to be identified with the interloping Judaizers whose nefarious work among the Galatians during Paul's absence (4 : 18) elicits his expressions of indignant surprise.

We are fortunately not altogether confined to New Testament writings for our conception of these antagonists of Paul and the nature of their opposition. The *Clementine Homilies* in their present form of about 200 A.D. reflect the hatred then still cherished among a Jewish Christian sect in Palestine, and retain certain echoes of the great Petro-Pauline conflict in the rebuke administered by Peter to Simon Magus (a pseudonym for Paul) in a colloquy which parodies that of Gal. 2 : 11-21: "If, then, our Jesus appeared to you in a vision, made himself known to you and spoke to you, it was as one who is enraged with an adversary (as the angel opposed Balaam). . . . But if he did appear to you and taught you, and you became his apostle for a single hour, proclaim his utterances, interpret his sayings, love his apostles, contend not with me who companied with him. For you now stand directly opposed to me who am a firm 'Rock' the 'foundation of the church' . . . as if I were a person manifestly 'condemned' and in bad repute."

Taken with Paul's own references, particularly in the

sarcastic comparison in 2 Corinthians 10-13, even this late echo of anti-Pauline reaction will throw much light on the plea of Paul's opponents. They did not deny "visions and revelations of the Lord," nor his former employment as an agent of the church in Antioch. But Paul, they said, had never seen Christ after the flesh, and displayed no "letters of commendation." He was conducting his missions now on his own responsibility, not venturing to claim support (2 Cor. 11:7-9). In pretending to dispense his converts from the burden of his support he was really dishonest; for he obtained afterwards much greater sums on false pretenses.<sup>1</sup> In assuming to dispense them from the obligation of the law, he was putting a violent and unauthorized interpretation of his own on the Scriptures, an interpretation repudiated by all "those of repute." Jesus himself and all the Twelve had acknowledged and lived under the law, whose divine authority even Paul would admit. Must not a gospel of such laxity from such a secondary source, they asked, be regarded with the greatest suspicion? Would it not be the part of safety at the very least to restore to it those divinely imposed conditions of salvation from which Paul was offering his dubious dispensation?

We cannot perhaps wonder quite so much as Paul at the promptness of the Galatians' inquiry evoked by representations such as these. For there is no intimation in Galatians of any intentional disloyalty, or denial of his apostleship, still less such an attack upon his personal integrity as later at Corinth (1 Cor. 9:1-3; 2 Cor. 12:11-18). Our Epistle seems to bespeak only a disposition on the part of the Galatians to supplement Paul's gospel by certain legal observances, and a failure to realize how much the term "apostle of Christ" implied to their founder. As yet they had adopted no more than the Mosaic sacred calendar, doubtless as a token of respect for "the angels" (see on 4:8-10). At all events little stress can be laid for the

<sup>1</sup> In Galatians there is no intimation that the charge of dishonesty had been raised. This appears later in the Corinthian letters.

determination of date upon Paul's indignant exclamation in 1 : 6. We can only infer that the time was long enough after Paul's second visit for the Judaizers to learn that the coast was clear and to intervene with their nefarious propaganda; and short enough for Paul, who certainly was never long out of touch with his churches (2 Cor. 11 : 28), to be amazed at the rapidity of the Judaizers' progress.

4. *The Historical Order of Events in Paul's Missionary Career.*—If the churches of the First Missionary Journey are Paul's "churches of Galatia," Acts 13 : 1-16 : 5 is Luke's account of the Galatian crisis and its settlement. In accordance with the general scheme of the book, wherein, as we have seen, Peter establishes the precedents for Paul, these chapters constitute a parallel to the story of Peter's work among the Gentiles in Cæsarea, his arraignment by the reactionaries in Jerusalem, and his vindication in the first Apostolic Conclave in Jerusalem in Acts 9 : 32-11 : 18. So with Paul in the work of evangelization undertaken by the leaders in Antioch. The Holy Ghost directs the enterprise; Barnabas and Paul go forth and reap the harvest; the church in Antioch sends them to Jerusalem, where they vindicate their course before "the apostles and elders."

In Appended Note B<sup>1</sup> we have made an attempt to bring out in contrast to this more or less theoretical account the indications of Galatians, and to some extent of Acts itself, of the historical course of events. The main differences concern: (1) The number and occasion of Paul's visits to Jerusalem; (2) the nature of the transactions between him and the Pillars.

(1) Notoriously Galatians leaves no room for a *second* visit to Jerusalem of Paul and Barnabas, but compels us to identify the conference of Gal. 2 : 1-10 either with that of Acts 11 : 30; 12 : 25, or Acts 15 : 2. As between the two we are compelled to choose the former. 1. Paul clearly implies that it was the first time he had been in Jerusa-

<sup>1</sup> See also my articles in *Amer. Journal of Theol.* for July, 1907, and January, 1909.

## INTRODUCTION

---

lem for "fourteen years." 2. He positively declares that the business which took him there was a private matter transacted between him and the three "pillars" without the participation of any ecclesiastical assembly. 3. The agreement reached had exclusive reference to the mission field which Paul and Barnabas were to occupy.

This leads to a chronology of events in Paul's missionary career of the following type:

Conversion, 32 or 34 A.D.

Sojourn in Arabia.

Return to Damascus.

First visit to Jerusalem for conference with Peter, 34 or 36 A.D.

(Escape from Damascus 37 A.D. or later.)

Missionary work in Syria and Cilicia, 34-47 A.D.

(Vision of 2 Cor. 12:2, 41 A.D.)

"False brethren" in Antioch, 44-46 A.D.

Barnabas and Paul in Antioch, 46-47 A.D.

Second visit to Jerusalem, for conference with the Pillars, 47 A.D.

First Missionary Journey. Founding of the churches of Cyprus and Galatia, 47-49 A.D.

Peter comes to Antioch, 48 A.D.

Convocation at Jerusalem. Delegation "from James," 48 A.D.

Paul's rupture with the leaders at Antioch. 49 A.D.

Second Missionary Journey. Founding of the churches of Macedonia and Achaia, 49-52 A.D.

Stay in Corinth, 50-52 A.D.

Epistle to the Galatians, 50 A.D.

Epistles to the Thessalonians, 50 A.D.

Paul in Ephesus. Founding of the churches of Asia, 52-55 A.D.

Paul revisits Syria, Antioch, and Galatia, 52-53 A.D.

First Epistle to the Corinthians, 54 A.D.

Paul revisits the churches of Macedonia and Achaia, 55-56 A.D.

Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 55 A.D.

Epistle to the Romans, 56 A.D.

Delegation to Jerusalem. Paul's arrest, 56 A.D.

(2) Nevertheless Luke's story of an Apostolic Council enacting "decrees" which settle all the "trouble" raised by the "believers of the sect of the Pharisees" with regard to the Galatian converts, so that Paul instead of resisting Peter to the face, distributes among them the decrees for to keep, quieting the opposition of "the Jews which were in those parts" by circumcising Timothy, has real foundation in fact. In Appended Note B, the relation of this convocation and its "decrees" to the private compact of Paul and Barnabas with the Pillars has been explained on the basis of a comparison which aims to do fuller justice to the intention of each narrator than is possible when disagreement is treated as a priori inadmissible.

From no other aspect does the Epistle to the Galatians appear in so inspiring a light as when viewed in contrast with Luke's conventionalized treatment of the subject. It burns with all the flaming ardor of a conflict which its author feels touches the very continuance of "the truth of the gospel." It reveals the very soul of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, admits us to the vicissitudes of his wonderful career, his conversion, his sense of apostleship, his calling from God, his "revelation" and "gospel." It shows his battles against the "false brethren" and his endeavors for an understanding with the older apostles, even at the cost of conflict. It shows his tenderness paving the way for that tactful and considerate treatment of the "weak brethren" which at last made it possible to hope that his "ministration which he had for Jerusalem might be acceptable to the saints," and that he himself should come at last "with joy" to "find rest" at Rome (Rom. 15:30-33). For all that bears upon the life of this great second founder of the faith, there is no introduction which can compare in power and pathos with the Epistle to the Galatians.

Because it thus bursts from the heart of the great apostle

of liberty, at an agonizing crisis of his conflict, this Epistle has been the palladium of liberty in every great struggle of the Church to assert the right of "the sons of God." Luther loved it as his "Katharine von Bora." Religious democracy will forever revert to it as the indefeasible magna charta of its rights. Nor will it detract from the service thus rendered to religious faith, that since the first awakening of historical study of the New Testament, the higher critic also finds here in this first great contemporary document the key to a historical view of the origins of the church.

## VII. ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE

In spite of its torrential sweep of feeling, the Epistle to the Galatians evinces a rigorous logical structure, recognized, in principal outline at least, by all students. As the primary condition of an adequate understanding of the document, we may exhibit this structure as follows:

- (I). Defence of Paul's Apostleship, cc. 1-2.
  - i. Preliminary, 1 : 1-10.
    - (1) Greeting, 1 : 1-5.
    - (2) Occasion of Writing and General Thesis, 1 : 6-10.
  - ii. Historical Review of Paul's Ministry from his Conversion to the first Outbreak of Opposition, 1 : 11-24.
    - (1) The Independence of his Entrance upon his Mission Work, 1 : 11-17.
    - (2) His Slight Relations with the Twelve thereafter, 1 : 18-24.
  - iii. Account of Previous Oppositions and Paul's Defence at Jerusalem and Antioch, c. 2.
    - (1) Indorsement of Paul and his Gospel of Freedom from the Law by the "Pillars" at Jerusalem and Agreement for a Division of Fields, 2 : 1-10.
    - (2) Rebuke of Peter and the Rest of the Jews at Antioch for coercing the Gentiles, 2 : 11-21.

- (a) The Conflict, 2 : 11-14.
- (b) The Argument (transitional), 2 : 15-21.

II. Defence of Paul's Gospel, 3 : 1-5 : 12.

i. Theoretical Argument against Legalism, c. 3.

General Statement of Principle. The Gift of the Spirit is the Sole and Decisive Test of Heirship, 3 : 1-5.

(1) The Abrahamic Promise Universal and based on Faith, 3 : 6-9.

(2) The Law brings not Blessing, but Curse, 3 : 10-12.

(3) Redemption from this Curse explains the Cross, 3 : 13-14.

(4) The Opponents' Doctrine makes the Law an Afterthought conditioning the Promise, and making Unjustifiable Distinctions between the Heirs, 3 : 15-29.

(a) Statement of the Two Principles, 3 : 15, 16.

(α) The Law is not a Condition limiting the Promise, 3 : 17-18.

(β) It is a Discipline to develop the Heir, 3 : 19-24.

(b) Conclusion: Faith, in Emancipating from this Discipline, nullifies Distinctions, justifying the Very Letter of the Promise, 3 : 25-29.

ii. Practical Application to the Galatians' Case, 4 : 1-5 : 12.

Restatement of the Principle of Adoption, 4 : 1-7.

(1) Inference as to Galatian Observance of Days, 4 : 8-11.

(2) Their Changed Attitude toward Paul, 4 : 12-20.

(3) Warning that Submission to the Yoke of the Law is a Return to Bondage, 4 : 21-30.

(4) Entreaty to have done with Judaizing, 4 : 31-5 : 12.

(a) Vigilance the Price of Liberty, 4 : 31-5 : 1.

## INTRODUCTION

---

(b) Circumcision as now urged incompatible with  
Faith, 5 : 2-6.

(c) The Agitators and their False Charge, 5 : 7-  
12.

III. Exhortation to Unity in Mutual Service, 5 : 13-6 : 18.

i. The Moral Effect of Paul's Gospel, 5 : 13-6 : 10.  
General Proposition. Christian Freedom is under the  
Law of Love, 5 : 13-15.

(1) Curbing of the Flesh is a Necessary Result of  
Dominion of the Spirit in the Individual, 5 : 16-24.

(2) It will also insure Unity in the Brotherhood,  
5 : 25-6 : 6.

(a) This Spirit prevents Friction in the Church,  
5 : 25-26.

(b) The Rule for "Those who Admonish," 6 : 1-5.

(c) The Rule for "Him that is Taught," 6 : 6.

(3) Moral Seriousness of Paul's Gospel reiterated.  
Grace does not supplant Retribution,  
6 : 7-10.

ii. Autograph Recapitulation and Farewell, 6 : 11-18.

(1) The Judaizers glory in Outward Show, 6 : 11-13.

(2) Paul glories in the Cross, 6 : 14.

(3) The Rule of General Application, 6 : 15-16.

iii. Paul's Scars his Talisman, 6 : 17.

IV. Benediction, 6 : 18.

## VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

### INTRODUCTION

BACON, B. W. An Introduction to the New Testament. *New Testament Handbooks*. New York. The Macmillan Co. 1900.  
Pp. 54-71.

JÜLICHER, ADOLF. An Introduction to the New Testament. New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1904. Pp. 32-200.

WEISS, BERNHARD. A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament. New York. The Funk & Wagnalls Co. 1889. Vol. I,  
Pp. 234-250.

## INTRODUCTION

---

MOFFATT, JAMES. *The Historical New Testament*. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark. 1901 (second ed.). Pp. 121-137, 150.  
SHAW, R. D. *The Pauline Epistles*. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark. 1904 (second ed.). Pp. 63-126.

### COMMENTARY

LIGHTFOOT, J. B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. New York. The Macmillan Co. 1896 (tenth ed.).

Still the best of its type. Learned and philological. Espouses the North Galatian theory. An equivalent commentary on the South Galatian side can only be found in the German of Th. Zahn (*Kommentar*, Bd. IX. 1905).

MEYER, H. A. W. *Commentary on the New Testament*. *Galatians*. Transl. from the fifth German edition. New York. Funk & Wagnalls. 1884.

HOLSTEN, C. *Short Protestant Commentary*. Vol. II, pp. 254-320. *Galatians*. Transl. from the third German edition. London and Edinburgh. Williams & Norgate. 1883.

DRUMMOND, JAS. *International Handbook to the New Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 189-242. New York. Putnam's. 1899.

RAMSAY, W. M. *Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. New York. Putnam's. 1900. See also *s.v.* "Galatia" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*.

Ramsay's work as a historical geographer is well known. He appears in the New Testament field as an ardent advocate of the South Galatian theory, and as apologete for the accuracy of Luke. The "Commentary" aims to throw light "on contemporary history in the widest sense—the history of religion, society, thought, manners, education—in the Eastern Provinces of the Empire."

JOWETT, B. *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans*. Vol. I. London. John Murray. 1859 (second ed.).

RENDALL, F. *Expositor's Greek Testament*. Vol. III, pp. 121-200. *Galatians*. New York. Dodd, Mead & Co. 1903.

ADENEY, W. F. *The Century Bible*. Vol. IX, 1 and 2 *Thessalonians, Galatians*. Pp. 58-154 and 257-339. Edinburgh and London. T. C. & E. C. Jack. No date.

### GENERAL

DODS, M., and FINDLAY, G. G., in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, *s.v.* "Galatians, Epistle to the," and *s.v.* "Paul the Apostle."

WOODHOUSE, W. J., and SCHMIEDEL, P. W., in Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica*, *s.v.* "Galatia" and "Galatians (the Epistle)."

## INTRODUCTION

---

HATCH, E., and VAN MANEN, W. C., *ibid. s.v.* "Paul," and *s.v.* "Romans."

KNOWLING, R. J. Witness of the Epistles. London and New York. Longmans, Green & Co. 1892.

WEINEL, H. St. Paul, the Man and his Work. New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906.

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON. Life and Epistles of St. Paul. New York. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1894.

CONE, O. Paul the Man, the Missionary and the Teacher. New York. The Macmillan Co. 1898.

SABATIER, A. The Apostle Paul. New York. James Pott & Co. 1891.

WREDE, W. Paul. London. Philip Green. 1907.

BAUR, F. C. Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ. (Translation from the second German ed.) London and Edinburgh. Williams & Norgate. 1876.

RENAN, E. St. Paul. New York. G. W. Carleton. 1869.

PFLEIDERER, O. Paulinism. London. Williams & Norgate. 1891.

STEVENS, G. B. The Pauline Theology. New York. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1894.

BRUCE, A. B. St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. New York. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1894.

DU BOSE, W. P. The Gospel according to St. Paul. New York. Longmans, Green & Co. 1907.



# THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

I. THE APOSTLESHIP CLAIMED BY PAUL NOT A MATTER  
OF HUMAN AUTHORIZATION. BEFORE THE PRES-  
ENT REACTION BEGAN HE HAD ALREADY  
SHOWN THE INDEPENDENCE OF HIS  
CALLING AND THE DIVINE AU-  
THORITY OF HIS MESSAGE  
AND TWICE VINDICATED IT  
BEFORE THE HIGHEST  
APOSTOLIC AU-  
THORITIES,  
I : 1-2 : 21

1. *The superhuman origin of his Gospel is proved from the history of his conversion and missionary career, I : 1-24*

1. PAUL, an <sup>o</sup>apostle (not from men, neither through  
<sup>1</sup> man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father,

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *a man*

*The Salutation: Greetings from an ambassador of heaven to churches founded on the hope of redemption, I : 1-5.*

The opening paragraph stands by itself. Its form is dictated by ancient epistolary etiquette, as modified by Jewish and Christian adaptation ("grace and peace" for the ordinary "greeting," Jas. 1 : 1). In this special case Paul's customary congratulations (*cf.* 1 Cor. 1 : 4-9) are omitted. Per contra he enlarges upon the title "apostle," and the implication of the expression "Lord Jesus Christ" (ver. 4). The reason is apparent from the implied circumstances (*cf.* ver. 11-12 and 2 : 21, and see above, Introduction, p. 31).

1. **Apostle.** The term owes its loftier significance to Paul, who in face of opponents that deny his "delegation" by any responsible body (1 Cor. 9 : 1-3), replies that he is an apostle (*i.e.*, "delegate")

I : I

---

2. who raised him from the dead), and all <sup>°</sup>the brethren which are with me, unto <sup>°</sup>the churches of Galatia:
3. Grace to you and peace <sup>¹</sup>from God the Father, and
4. our Lord Jesus Christ, who <sup>°</sup>gave himself <sup>²</sup>for our sins,

---

<sup>¹</sup>from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ    <sup>²</sup>Or, on behalf of

---

*from God.* The raising of Jesus and manifestation of him to Paul constituted the latter a “delegate.” For two generations the ordinary sense of the term “apostle,” a Greek word naturally applied by the Gentile churches to all duly accredited travelling evangelists, continued alongside the special (Rom. 16: 7; 1 Thess. 2: 6; Acts 14: 14; *Teaching of the Twelve*, 11: 3-4). Gradually it was restricted to the Twelve as having been the original “delegates” of Jesus. Where Paul’s authority has remained unquestioned he does not advance his claim to the title (1 Thess. 1: 1; 2 Thess. 1: 1; Philem. 1). Here he insists upon it, but in a sublimated sense.

2. **The brethren which are with me.** Silas and Timothy, so well known to the Galatians, would be mentioned by name if present at the time (*cf.* 1 and 2 Thess. 1: 1). The Galatians are supposed to know who are meant. Probably their own messengers are included. See Introduction, p. 33.

3. **The churches of Galatia.** Probably those whose foundation is related in Acts 13-14 are principally addressed. See Introduction, p. 18 ff. The letter is intended for circulation over a large district.

4. This verse is added to the more or less conventional form of salutation already current (ver. 3; *cf.* Rom. 1: 7; 1 Cor. 1: 3; 2 Cor. 1: 2; etc.) to give it exceptional solemnity. Emphasis is laid upon the self-surrender of Jesus to death as the divinely appointed means of deliverance from the evil fate of the world, because the reactionary teachers were making this doctrine of “grace” void; *cf.* 2: 21.

**Gave himself for our sins.** The doctrine of the vicariousness of the suffering of Jesus was one which Paul “received” at the outset from the believers whom he had been persecuting (1 Cor. 15: 3). Without some such apologetic, primitive faith in Jesus as the Christ could not have survived the assaults of Judaism. But Paul always avoids the cruder form of the doctrine which may be called the “substitutionary.” In this form Jesus is said to have died “in our stead” (*anti*), as against the Pauline “for us” (*peri*) or “for our advantage” (*hyper*) (see on 2: 16). In non-Pauline writings of the New Testament it rests upon the Isaian doctrine of the Suffering Servant (Is. 53: 4-6, 11). This doctrine of substitution is pre-Christian. It had been used by the authors of second and fourth Maccabees to explain the sufferings of the Maccabean martyrs (2 Macc. 7: 37 f.; 4 Macc. 6: 29).

that he might deliver us out of <sup>°</sup>this present evil <sup>1</sup> world,  
 5. according to the will of our God and Father: <sup>°</sup>to whom  
 be the glory <sup>2</sup>for ever and ever. <sup>°</sup>Amen.

<sup>1</sup> Or, *age*    <sup>2</sup> Gr. *unto the ages of the ages.*

In Mark and 1 Peter (Mk. 10: 45; 14: 24; 1 Pt. 2: 24) the very phraseology of Isaiah is applied to the death of Jesus. Paul seems to take special pains to avoid both the phraseology and the implications of the substitutionary theory, conceiving the suffering of Jesus in a more moral sense (see on 2: 21; 3: 13 f.). But to Paul also the evil conditions out of which the sons of God must be delivered were the consequence of "our sins," and "our sins" are therefore the ultimate explanation of Christ's suffering, so that the Old Testament description of sacrifice as "for (*peri*) sin" becomes appropriate (*cf.* Eph. 5: 2). In fact the whole story of Jesus' earthly career and fate is for Paul almost lost in the excelling glory of the supramundane drama. For him the gospel consists essentially of nothing else but the transaction by which the preëxistent Son of God obediently humbled himself unto incarnation and death, and was for this reason exalted to God's right hand (*cf.* Phil. 2: 5-11). This cosmic drama is conceived under the forms of Israel's redemption from bondage in Egypt; *cf.* Eph. 1: 5-14; 1 Cor. 10: 1-6; 5: 7. Thus ver. 1 expresses Paul's apostleship in a nutshell, ver. 4 his message.

**This present evil world.** Rabbinic doctrine distinguished between "this world" (or "age"), subjected to demonic powers (4: 1-5), Rom. 8: 20), and the "age to come," which after victory over these should be under the direct rule of God and his Christ (4: 9; Heb. 2: 5-8). The revelation of this Christ, victorious in the resurrection, is therefore by implication an "assurance to all men" of the impending judgment and "restoration of all things" (Acts 17: 30-31; 1 Thess. 1: 10).

5. **To whom (be) the glory for ever and ever.** Or, "whose is the glory;" *i.e.*, the praise rightly belonging to this deliverance.

**Amen.** The doxology with its Hebrew response (*Amen*, "Be it so") appears already naturalized on Gentile soil. To Paul this is a favorite method of setting a period to his sublimest thoughts, especially when he has had occasion to set forth the redeeming "will of God" (*cf.* Rom. 11: 33-12: 2; Eph. 1: 6, 9, 11, 12; 3: 19-21).

*The Occasion of the Epistle: Incipient desertion by the Galatian churches of Paul's gospel of liberty for that of the Judaizers, 1: 6-10.*

6-7. These two indignant verses take the place of the usual congratulations on the readers' progress in the faith, and prayer for their continuance. The omission is paralleled by the absence of any com-

6.    "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from <sup>°</sup>him  
       that called you <sup>1</sup>in the <sup>°</sup>grace of Christ unto <sup>°</sup>a different  
 7. gospel; which is not another *gospel*: only there are  
       <sup>°</sup>some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel  
 8. of Christ. But though <sup>°</sup>we, or an angel from heaven,

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *in grace*

---

mendatory adjective qualifying the bald "churches of Galatia" in the salutation. *Cf.* Rom. 1 : 7; 1 Cor. 1 : 2, etc.

6. **I marvel.** The news has taken Paul by surprise. His experiences with the work of the Judaizers at Corinth cannot therefore be taken to lie between the second visit with its warning against "another gospel" (ver. 9) and the time of writing. See Introduction, p. 33.

**Him that called you.** The "calling" (*clesis*) which constitutes the new Israel, or commonwealth (*ecclesia*) of Christ, is always in New Testament thought a "calling of God" (*cf.* 1 Pt. 5 : 10). Here it is recalled that its nature was "grace," not merit (*cf.* Eph. 2 : 5, 8).

The reading of R. V., **grace of Christ**, is improbable. The genitive "Christ" seems to have been added to determine the reference of the participle "him that called." It was in reality a "perversion of the gospel of Christ" (*i.e.*, not the glad tidings about Christ but brought by him) to make those to whom he had proclaimed forgiveness as a "Friend of sinners" seek to win that forgiveness by imitating the Pharisees! Paul was true to the primitive gospel in maintaining that it was "for the ungodly." Obscuration of this is the denial of "grace"; *cf.* Eph. 2 : 5, 8; 1 Tim. 1 : 15, and see note on 2 : 16).

**A different gospel.** Etymologically the word rendered "different" means other of two. In common employment it seems to have connoted difference in kind, as against the word rendered "another" in the next clause, other of many. At all events the scornful employment of the phrase shows that Paul is quoting his adversaries. They had offered to complete Paul's gospel with one which would make the convert "perfect" (*cf.* 3 : 3). It may be possible to render the following clause "which is nothing else but that," etc., but the R. V. is preferable, because the new preaching did not purport to controvert, but to supplement, Paul. His answer is, No second gospel can exist. So far as the preaching of the Judaizers is new it is not gospel. So far as it is gospel it is not new.

7. **Some that trouble you.** Purposely unnamed, as in 5 : 7, 10, 12; 6 : 12. In 4 : 30 it seems to be intimated that they come from Jerusalem. At all events they were outsiders. See Introduction.

8. **We.** Grammatically this should refer to the individuals of ver.

should preach <sup>1</sup> unto you any gospel <sup>2</sup> other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema.

9. As <sup>3</sup> we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that  
 10. which ye received, let him be <sup>4</sup> anathema. For am I now <sup>5</sup> persuading men, or God? or am I seeking to <sup>6</sup> please men? <sup>7</sup> if I were still <sup>8</sup> pleasing men, I should not be a <sup>9</sup> servant of Christ.

<sup>1</sup> Some ancient authorities omit *unto you*. <sup>2</sup> Or, *contrary to that* <sup>3</sup> Or, *I* <sup>4</sup> Some ancient authorities add *for*. <sup>5</sup> Gr. *bondservant*.

2, but “we preached” shows that Silas at least is included in thought, though the clear distinction of number in ver. 9 (“we,” “I”) shows that he is not personally present.

**Other than.** The preposition may mean either “besides” or “against”; see alternate rendering. If R. V. be followed in ver. 7, we must take the former sense.

9. **We** (var. *I*) **have said before.** The warning is more likely to have been given on the second of the two visits referred to in 4 : 13. Supposing this visit to be that described in Acts 16 : 6 we can well understand Paul’s solicitude. Silas, who had then joined in the warning, has now no part in it. See preceding note and Introduction, p. 32. The var. “*I*” has inferior attestation and is of interest only as showing that later copyists noticed the contrast of number and assumed to correct it.

**Anathema.** A Greek word corresponding to the Hebrew *herem*, denoting an object consigned to the powers of the underworld. Cf. 1 Cor. 5 : 5.

10. **Persuading men . . . please men . . . pleasing men.** The phrase rankles with Paul. It had been applied to him by the Judaizers, who thus turned his conciliatory principle, “All things to all men that I may gain the more” (1 Cor. 9 : 21), into an accusation against him. In 5 : 11; 6 : 17, he adds further intimations that there are limits beyond which conciliation may cease to be a virtue. In the form “man-pleaser,” already current in earlier Jewish literature (*Ps. Sal.* 4 : 8, 10), Paul himself applies the opprobrious epithet, 1 Thess. 2 : 4, Eph. 6 : 6. Here the sense is: If they tell you I am smooth-tongued, tell them I say — and reiterate — a curse on the man, or the angel from heaven, who perverts the principles you received from me.

(1) *The superhuman origin of Paul’s apostleship and gospel proved from the circumstances of his conversion, 1 : 11-17.*

11.     <sup>o</sup>1 For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not <sup>o</sup>after man. For neither did <sup>o</sup>I receive it from <sup>2</sup>man, nor was I taught it, but *it came to me* through <sup>o</sup>revelation of 13. Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my manner of life in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *but*      <sup>2</sup> Or, *a man*

---

11. **For.** This better attested reading of the R. V. (against A. V. "but") connects the argument now begun with ver. 10, justifying its almost violent language, and thus leading over to the systematic defence. Paul's gospel tolerates no supplementation in principle because it is not *after man*, *i.e.* was not a product of human reflection and adaptation. This conviction is the basis of Paul's indomitable courage and sublime authority. I in ver. 12 is emphatic, "As for me, I neither," etc. Ver. 13 indicates in what sense. Paul alone among Christians had been a persecutor, 1 Tim. 1 : 12-16. He spoke out of a unique personal experience, which to his mind was susceptible of no other explanation than the miraculous intervention of God. A much later writer seeking to vindicate a similar authority for Peter puts in the mouth of Jesus a declaration so closely similar to that of this paragraph that literary independence is inadmissible. Peter also had received his manifestation of the Christ by revelation from God and not from "flesh and blood." While his first thought had been "after the things of men" (Mk. 8 : 33) he was taught by a "voice from heaven" the true nature of the messianic redemption (Mt. 16 : 17-19, 23; 17 : 1-8).

12. **Revelation of Jesus Christ.** The genitive is, probably objective, "It came to me by God's manifestation of the risen Christ," *cf.* ver. 1 and ver. 16 and 2 Cor. 4 : 6. Had Paul referred to instruction through subsequent "visions and revelations of (*i.e.*, from) the Lord" there would have been imperative occasion to mention these, as in 2 Cor. 12 : 1-4.

13-17. *How Paul's gospel came to him.* The object of this brief rehearsal of the circumstances of his conversion, a story already known in general outline to the Galatians (ver. 13), is to justify as divinely authorized that doctrine of freedom from the law which Paul's opponents declared to be his own later addition, a concession designed to facilitate his propaganda among the Gentiles. The coincident elements of both "gospels" are not considered. While still a persecutor Paul had of course not been ignorant of the doctrine of his victims, nor of the general career and teaching of their Master. In

measure I persecuted <sup>o</sup>the church of God, and made  
 14. havock of it: and I advanced in the Jews' religion  
 beyond many of mine own age <sup>1</sup>among my country-  
 men, being more exceedingly <sup>o</sup>zealous for the traditions  
 15. of my fathers. But when it was the good pleasure of

Is. 49:1

<sup>1</sup> Gr. *in my race*

ver. 18 he freely concedes his wish to learn from "Cephas" in such matters, which were, however, to him always secondary (2 Cor. 5:16). The point in dispute is the conditions of salvation. Do they, or do they not, include "works of the law"? The reversal of Paul's conviction on this point was far from having been a later concession to Gentile prejudices. It was not derived from human teachers such as Stephen, Ananias of Damascus, or Barnabas; nor even from conscious reflection in Paul's own mind. It had been involved in the sudden manifestation of God's Son "in" him, an answer for which Paul himself had been totally unprepared, to the despairing struggle of his soul after "righteousness," Rom. 7:15-25; Phil. 3:8-11. It had been (to Paul) the most vital element of that revelation. Hence from the very outset, and consistently, and by divine authorization, Paul's gospel had been "without the law," a commission distinctively "to the Gentiles"; ver. 16, Eph. 3:6, 8.

13. **The Church of God.** The commonwealth of believers, already conceived as "the Israel of God," 6:16; messianic counterpart of the "general assembly" (Heb. *qahal*, rendered *ecclesia*, i.e., "Church," in Gr. Old Testament) of the people "called" out of Egypt. This Old Testament sense seems to be the primary one. It conceives the brotherhood as "an elect race" (1 Pt. 1:1; 2:9; Jas. 1:1) the roll-call of whose names is kept in the (as yet) heavenly seat of empire, 4:26; Phil. 3:20; cf. Lk. 10:20. From it is derived (not without influence from purely Greek usage, Acts 19:41) the secondary application to local subdivisions, "the Church in" Rome, Thessalonica, etc.; "the churches of" Galatia, Asia, Judæa (ver. 22). In the case last mentioned, the distinctive clause "those in Christ" has to be added to exclude the synagogues.

14. **Zealous for the traditions.** The words are not used in the technical sense. Even if it could be supposed that Paul would expect these Gentiles to appreciate the technical meaning of "Zealotry" and "tradition" (as against the written law), the Zealot party was not congenial to Paul, and comes forward at a later date. To Greeks "the traditions of my fathers" could only be synonymous here with "the Jews' religion."

15. The figure and phraseology are borrowed from Jer. 1:5. Paul

Jer. 1:5

<sup>1</sup>God, who separated me, *even* from my mother's womb,  
 16. and called me through his grace, <sup>°</sup>to reveal his Son in  
 me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; im-  
 17. mediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither  
 went I <sup>2</sup>up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles  
 before me: but <sup>°</sup>I went away into Arabia; and again  
 I returned unto Damascus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Better authorities, *him*.      <sup>2</sup> Or, *away*

---

is unable to explain such gracious intervention on God's part, save in the light of his entire previous career, including his birth and environment. So peculiarly did they fit him to preach Christ among the Gentiles, that the unique experience through which he alone had been brought to the knowledge of the Redeemer must be attributed to a special decree of divine foresight ("the good pleasure of God") whose intention must be construed to have been the breaking down of the barrier of the law, the "middle wall of partition" which still operated to exclude Gentiles from the gospel of redemption. The fact of Paul's having been the extreme representative of legalistic opposition to the gospel of grace was even more providential from this point of view than the qualifications of his birth and breeding; *cf.* ver. 14.

16. **To reveal his Son in me.** Paul's gospel is concerned with the *person* of Christ. The way of life which Jesus taught and the particular incidents of his public ministry are to Paul of secondary importance. See Appended Note A.

17. **I went away into Arabia . . . I returned unto Damascus.** "Returned" implies that the conversion had been at Damascus as Acts relates. The story was well known, as ver. 13 implies. Acts knows nothing of this journey into "Arabia," but after a stay of "certain days" in Damascus "with the disciples" during which Paul proclaimed Jesus as the Christ "in the synagogues," he goes at once to Jerusalem "to join himself to the disciples" and begins an unsuccessful work under their direction among "the Greek-speaking Jews" (Acts 9:19-30; 22:6-21). The grouping of paragraphs in Galatians also suggests that the first three years (ver. 11-17) are thought of rather as the time of Paul's receiving his gospel, the next eleven (or fourteen?) as the time of his imparting it. We need not think of Elijah's flight to Horeb "the mount of God" as in Paul's mind, though he clearly contrasts "Arabia" with "the apostles in Jerusalem" as possible sources for his gospel. "Arabia" is simply the kingdom of Aretas, and during at least a part of Paul's earlier

18. Then <sup>o</sup>after three years I went up to Jerusalem <sup>o</sup>to  
 19. <sup>1</sup>visit <sup>2</sup>Cephas, and tarried with him fifteen days. But  
 other of the apostles saw I none, <sup>3</sup>save <sup>o</sup>James the

<sup>1</sup> Or, *become acquainted with*   <sup>2</sup> Western authorities, *Peter.*   <sup>3</sup> Or, *but only*

career included Damascus itself (2 Cor. 11 : 32, 33). Paul's escape, however, was probably later, during the period of missionary activity in "Syria" (ver. 21), for Damascus was in Roman control until 37 A.D. The emphasis here laid upon Paul's independence of Jerusalem and its authorities has for its aim the very opposite of Acts, where the dependence of Paul on the apostles and his intimate and loyal coöperation with them until "sent away" for his own security to Tarsus, is emphasized as the proof of his faithful and submissive service. His work as a missionary to *Gentiles* begins after Barnabas brings him to Antioch, on special revelation of "the Holy Ghost" (Acts 11 : 25, 26; 13 : 1-4). On the difference in view-point between Paul and Luke see Introduction, pp. 11-19, and Appended Note B.

(2) *Paul's earlier missionary career and its acceptance at Jerusalem, 18-24.*

18. **After three years.** In Acts (9 : 26) Paul comes to Jerusalem in flight from Damascus. He arrives so soon after his conversion that "the disciples" have not yet heard of it; and comes to begin his work there as a preacher to the Hellenistic Jews (9 : 27-29; 22 : 17-20). By his own story this coming was a mere brief visit. He does not appear to be a fugitive, and the journey has no relation to the crisis created by his conversion.

**To visit.** The alternate rendering aims to do better justice to the Greek (*historesai*), which involves the idea of learning the "story" of Peter, who is here called by the name "Cephas" current among Jewish Christians. If Paul has here the intention of missionary work — and the analogy of the subsequent visit with Barnabas suggests it (2 : 2) — it is not to convert his unbelieving countrymen in Jerusalem (Acts 22 : 6-21), but Gentiles "in the regions of Syria and Cilicia."

19. **James the Lord's brother.** Eldest of the sons of Joseph and Mary mentioned in Mk. 6 : 3. In the Jerusalem church the kindred of Jesus early attained a preëminence long preserved. In Gal. 2 : 9, 12 and Acts 12 : 17; 15 : 13; 21 : 18 it is implied that James had become head of the local brotherhood, to the subordination even of Peter. On Paul's earlier visit "Peter" is the leading figure. "James" is only one of the "others." He is not an "apostle" (travelling evangelist) but a "pillar." The marginal rendering "but only" should be followed, for the exception here is not from the noun "apostles," but from the force of the verb ("save that I did see,") as in ver. 7, and 2 : 16.

20. Lord's brother. Now touching the things which I  
 21. write unto you, behold, <sup>°</sup>before God, I lie not. Then  
 22. I came into the regions of <sup>°</sup>Syria and Cilicia. And I  
 was still <sup>°</sup>unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa

---

**20. Before God, I lie not.** The use of an oath indicates how great importance Paul attached to the independence of his career. The accusation against him was not that he had not formerly been all that could be asked of a missionary, but that he had subsequently departed from the true doctrine as he had originally received it from the Twelve. The example of Acts shows how even the friendly disposed might think to enhance Paul's authority by attributing to him an apostleship "from men" (Acts 9 : 26-30; 13 : 1-3). Paul claims to be teaching just what he had always taught. If his opponents had taken pains to ascertain they would have found it so. They assume that his gospel could not go beyond the teaching of his predecessors. Luke makes the same assumption from a different motive. Paul contends that it went beyond theirs from the start.

**21. Syria and Cilicia.** The Taurus range marks the true boundary for ancient thought between Asia Minor and the Syrian coast. This coördinates Cilicia with Syria as in Acts 15 : 23, 41. Paul certainly conceives his work by geographical stages from Jerusalem (*cf.* Rom. 15 : 19), which *may* account for the mention of Syria before Cilicia, though 2 Cor. 11 : 32-33 strengthens the case for prolonged missionary work in Syria between the sojourn in Arabia (ver. 17) and that in Tarsus (Acts 11 : 25). But the principal difficulty with the phrase is the limitation of the field to the territory south of the Taurus range. The conflicting representation of Acts, which places the First Missionary Journey *before* the conference in Jerusalem, seems to rest upon theoretical considerations already explained. *Cf.* Acts 15 : 23 and see Introduction, p. 11 ff., and Appendix Note B. We may reasonably infer from Paul's silence here regarding Cyprus and Galatia that his activity had *not* yet extended beyond "Syria and Cilicia." The visit with Barnabas to the Pillars (2 : 1-10) has in contemplation a field of missionary activity in which the evangelizers wish to be free from the annoying intervention of the "false brethren."

**22. Unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa.** A more exact rendering would be "I was becoming unknown." The tense (periphrastic imperfect) does not of course cover the period of persecution. "Judæa" in Pauline use (see Introduction, p. 24) includes at least Cæsarea besides Jerusalem, and thus conflicts with Acts 9 : 30. But the instructive difference between the two narrations does not consist in mere items of detail, which by those so disposed might individually be coerced into agreement, but in the general contrast in point of

23. which were <sup>°</sup>in Christ: but they only heard say, He that once persecuted us now preacheth <sup>°</sup>the faith of  
 24. which he once made havock; and they glorified God in me.

2. *On two occasions Paul had vindicated his apostleship and gospel before the highest human authorities, 2 : 1-21*

2. Then <sup>°</sup><sup>1</sup> after the space of fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with <sup>°</sup>Barnabas, taking <sup>°</sup>Titus also

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *in the course of*

---

view, which is obvious so soon as each is read by itself. See Introduction.

**In Christ.** Synagogues also might be called “churches,” and conversely. On the Pauline formula “in Christ Jesus” see on 2 : 4.

**23. The faith.** The expression is on the road toward its later sense, a form of doctrine. As yet it does not imply more than an attitude of mind. The Christians of Judæa heard that Paul was now inciting to that *disposition of trust in Jesus* which had previously enraged him. They had not yet cared to question whether he required his converts to accept the law.

24. As usually happens in controversy, each party accused the other of inconsistency. Paul intimates that formerly the Jewish churches were very well pleased with his work. In all probability they would have been more dubious if they had had closer acquaintance with it. The Judaizers accuse Paul of inconsistency. Formerly he had “preached circumcision.” He even did so still upon occasion, when it seemed politic (5 : 11). The desire to make easy conversions had led him, they intimated, to forsake the true doctrine as he had learned it from apostles.

(1) *The action taken by the Jerusalem authorities when made more closely acquainted with the nature of Paul's work, 2 : 1-10.*

1. The identification of this visit to Jerusalem is one of the most vital points in all New Testament history. (See Introduction, p. 15, and Appended Note B.) The ordinary supposition that the “ministration” visit of Acts 11 : 30; 12 : 25 was left unmentioned (!) by Paul though of real occurrence in the interval between 1 : 18 and 2 : 1, is made incredible by the solemnity of the asseverations in 1 : 20 and 22. Equally incredible is the dissociation of the supreme issue, for the settlement of which Paul made the momentous journey here

2. with me. And <sup>o</sup>I went up by revelation; and I <sup>o</sup>laid before them the gospel which I preach among the Gen-

described, from the occasion which in Acts 15:1-5 is made central to the whole narrative. It is impossible to admit as historical this addition of a *third* visit to Jerusalem, and the transaction of certain matters explicitly excluded by Paul's definite statements. These matters, however, are far from being mere fictions of Luke. They are merely transferred from their true order in accordance with his theoretical rearrangement of his material. See Introduction, p. 15, and Appended Note B.

**After the space of fourteen years.** See alternate rendering. The Greek is ambiguous. Paul may be reckoning from his conversion, 1:15, or from his first visit, 1:18. The apparent division of his career into a first period marked rather by reflection and inquiry than by evangelistic effort, 1:15-20, and a second marked by work in Syria and Cilicia, 1:21-24, is perhaps favorable to the longer reckoning. In any event we must by modern reckoning count not fourteen but thirteen. Ancient reckoning counts both termini.

**Barnabas.** The name, though Aramaic, is strangely heathen for a Levite. In Acts 4:36 it is explained as a surname given "by the apostles" to the Cypriote convert, whose real name was Joseph. Apparently by combination of the Aramaic *bar* ("son") with the Hebrew *naba* ("to prophesy" or "exhort") the sense "Son of exhortation" is obtained. The name is really formed from the Syrian divinity Nebo or Nabu (cf. *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Nabonassar*) with the prefix *Bar* (cf. *Barabbas*, *Bartimaeus*, *Bartholomew*, *Bar-Jesus*). One of the primitive believers in Jerusalem, related to Mary, mother of John Mark, a man who had consecrated property to the Church. Despatched to Antioch because of rumors of its Gentile tendencies, he espoused the liberal side and reënforced it by securing the accession of Paul. At Antioch the two are commissioned first to negotiate in Jerusalem, thereafter to an evangelistic campaign in Gentile territory. Until the great exploit of Paul at Paphos (Acts 13:6-12) Barnabas appears always as leader, and his name is mentioned first. Thereafter we have not "Barnabas and Saul," but "Paul and Barnabas" *except in the letter of commendation*, Acts 15:25. The story of Paul's rupture with Barnabas is briefly given in Gal. 2:13, and — with a different, much less adequate motive — in Acts 15:27-29. Subsequently Paul mentions him with respect (1 Cor. 9:6), but there are no traces of resumption of the cordial relations here referred to. The terms seem to presuppose the readers' acquaintance with the man.

**Titus.** A valued lieutenant of Paul only less prominent than Timothy in his later missionary work (2 Cor. 2:13; 7:6, 13, 14; 8:6,

tiles, but <sup>o</sup>privately before them who <sup>1</sup> were <sup>o</sup>of repute,  
<sup>o</sup>lest by any means I should be running, or had run,

<sup>1</sup> Or, *are*

16, 23; 12 : 18; 2 Tim. 4 : 10; Tit. 1 : 4). Timothy is fully introduced in Acts 16 : 1-3, and repeatedly referred to. Titus is never mentioned by Luke. The reason is probably connected with the fact that Titus had been made by Paul the example of what he would *not* yield to Jewish scruples (Gal. 2 : 3), Timothy was the typical example of his supreme concession (Acts 16 : 3). In fact the advantage taken of it seems to have made Paul regret having yielded so far.

**2. I went up by revelation.** Whether the intimation by "the Spirit" was through Paul himself or some other "prophet" in the Antioch church, or both, and whether it was accompanied or not by official action, is immaterial; though Paul emphasizes the former, Acts (characteristically) the latter (Acts 15 : 2). Paul's omission of reference here to the historical occasion (see however the reference to the "spies" in ver. 4) is fortunately supplied by Luke (Acts 15 : 1). There is no *suppressio veri*. The point made is that it was no lack of authority felt by Paul himself which induced him now to submit his gospel so long preached without conference with "flesh and blood" (1 : 16, 17) to the approval or disapproval of the Jerusalem authorities. He did so by divine direction.

**Laid before them.** The same verb as in 1 : 16 without the reënforcing preposition (*pros*). Paul's gospel was not submitted for alteration, which would be inconceivable to him (1 : 7-9). If with the most distinguished English commentators we render the last clause of the verse "in order that I might not have run . . . in vain," the object of the visit was to avoid the probable frustration of his former work, and the threatened interference with that which he and Barnabas had in contemplation. If we render it with German authorities as an indirect question, "Whether I had run or was running in vain," the object was to obtain the acknowledgment actually received from the "pillars." Had it been refused Paul's conviction would not have been altered. His question in the *oratio directa* would have been "*Does it seem to you* that I have been, or am running in vain?" The distinction of tenses in the last clause of the verse is intended to differentiate his earlier mission field from that now in contemplation.

**Privately before them who were of repute.** Again we note the characteristic difference of Luke's point of view. In Acts no reference is made to any conference of Paul and Barnabas on a footing of equality with "the pillars." They merely present their report as delegates from the Antioch church, submitting the question, which is then settled by "the apostles and elders" without their participa-

3. in vain. But not even Titus who was with me, being  
 4. a Greek, <sup>°</sup>was compelled to be circumcised: <sup>1</sup> and that

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *but it was because of*

---

tion, What shall be required of Gentile believers? The result is then transmitted to the consulting church. Paul declares that he would not have submitted his gospel to the approval or disapproval of any man, had not the importance of keeping "the truth of the gospel" intact "unto" the Galatians induced him to "yield for an hour on the point of precedence." See on ver. 5. Public gatherings he expressly excludes. If such there were, they did not affect the agreement.

**Of repute.** Greek usage seems to require that something be tacitly supplied: "reputed (*sc.* to be authorities)." Ver. 9 uses the figure "pillars" and shows that James, Peter, and John are chiefly in view. The phrase, though probably borrowed from Paul's opponents (see on ver. 6), involves no disrespect for the apostles, but only for the opponents' view of what constitutes "authority."

**Lest by any means.** See the note on *laid before them*.

3. From the point of view of mere grammar the introduction of "was compelled" leaves it an uncertainty, for moderns ignorant of the facts, whether Titus was (a) not circumcised at all, or (b) only that it was not a matter of compulsion, but voluntary. Practically the former (a) is certain. The whole tone of the narrative shows that Paul would have regarded it — and justly — as an abject surrender of the principle for whose defence he went up, to yield on this crucial point. If he "yielded for an hour" (see on ver. 5), it was not on *this* issue, but on that of "rank" (R. V. "subjection"). The addition of the clause "although he was a Greek," strengthens the case against the idea that Titus was actually circumcised, and also suggests that the Galatians had not the same acquaintance with him as with Barnabas.

**Was** (or "had been") **compelled.** The tense is the indefinite past (aorist) and leaves no means of determining when the attempt was made. The context, however, makes it probable that the pressure was exerted and resisted at Antioch, *before* the journey to Jerusalem. See on ver. 4, and *cf.* Acts 15:1-2.

4. As indicated by the alternate rendering, there is extreme difficulty in determining what it was that took place "because of the false brethren." Certainly not the circumcision of Titus, for that Paul would have resisted all the more because of their demand. And almost certainly not the refusal; for that would have been maintained, false brethren or no false brethren. The real key is afforded by the textual phenomena (see var.). We must read: "But on ac-

because of the <sup>o</sup>false brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have <sup>o</sup>in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:

5. <sup>o</sup><sup>1</sup> to whom we gave place in the way of subjection, <sup>1</sup> no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might

<sup>1</sup> The oldest authorities (western) omit *to whom, no, not.*

count of the false brethren . . . who came in (at Antioch) to spy out our liberty . . . we yielded for an hour on the question of precedence." That is, Paul waived temporarily the question of his personal independence, and went up to Jerusalem to lay his gospel before the Pillars (cf. 1 : 16, 17). This statement was corrected (probably by Marcion) to "did *not* yield," and later (to improve the grammar) to "to whom we did not yield." The correction was thereafter widely adopted, because the yielding was supposed to be on the point of circumcising Titus — a manifest impossibility. But the earliest witnesses to the text indicate that it read "we yielded." Tertullian (*ca. 210 A.D.*) denounces Marcion for introducing the negative "did *not* yield."

**False brethren privily brought in.** Certainly the same referred to in Acts 15 : 1, who "came down from Judaea (to Antioch) and taught the brethren, saying, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved." The doublet (Acts 11 : 22-30) substitutes "prophets," after the pattern of 15 : 32 and 21 : 10, even borrowing "Agabus" from the latter passage, and makes of what Paul calls his "ministration" or "contribution for the poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem" (Rom. 15 : 26, 31) a parallel by the church in Antioch to the famous munificence of Helena of Adiabene on occasion of the great Palestinian famine of A.D. 45-46 (Josephus, *Antiq. XX*, ii. 1-5, and v. 2). Paul implies that local disaffection had "brought in" the reactionaries, and does not hesitate to impute to them the motive of spying upon "our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus" — a liberty, of course, not enjoyed in Judaea. The issue had been drawn over Titus.

**In Christ Jesus.** Paul is the originator of the striking use of the preposition "in" with the name of a person. He employs the present expression with extreme frequency to express his mystical conception of union with the spiritual Son of God, whether individually or as a church. The Christian's life is in a living organic connection with the all-pervading Spirit of the Lord. See notes on 3 : 26-29.

5. **To whom . . . no not.** The omission of these (Gr. two) important words in the chief "western" authority for the text makes a decided difference for the clearness of the grammar, and some dif-

6. continue <sup>o</sup>with you. But from those who <sup>1</sup>were <sup>o</sup>reputed to be somewhat (<sup>2</sup> whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person) — they, I say, who were of repute <sup>o</sup>imparted nothing to

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, are    <sup>2</sup> Or, *what they once were*

---

ference, though not a vital one, for the actual sense. The addition of the two words (if unauthentic) is easily explicable (see on ver. 4). If the doubtful words are authentic, it may imply that a new attempt was made by the “false brethren” or their sympathizers in Jerusalem, but does not affect the principal point, that Paul made strenuous and effectual resistance.

**With you.** Gr. “unto” (*pros* not *para*). The Galatians at the time had not yet been evangelized, but that the truth of the gospel might remain (unimpaired) *unto* them as well as to other Gentiles still more remote it was imperative that Paul should yield on the minor point of his personal precedence (or *not* yield to the demand that Titus be circumcised).

**6. Reputed to be somewhat.** The persons referred to are named in ver. 9. The reiteration (ver. 2, 6 bis, 9) of so singular a designation for James and Peter and John suggests that Paul is sarcastically quoting his opponents (see on ver. 2). They had declared that the real authorities would not indorse Paul's gospel. The Jerusalem conference, as Paul says, and as the nature of the compact would suggest, had been “private.”

**Whatsoever.** So R. V. rightly. The Greek permits the alternate rendering, but the context is opposed. The parenthetical depreciation of personal comparisons shows how distasteful to Paul had been even such concession as he had felt obliged to make to his opponents' methods.

**Imparted nothing.** The question had been as to the completeness of Paul's gospel. Were there not conditions attached to the offer of salvation by “the grace of Christ,” which he had suppressed? But for the exception noted in ver. 10, which certainly is not a “condition of salvation,” we might explain the omission of all reference to the four “necessary things” prescribed in Acts 15 : 29 by the fact that they appear to be asked — not to say demanded — as an accommodation to Jewish scruples, and not as intrinsically necessary. The nature of the exception is such as to exclude specific stipulations such as these. Moreover Paul treats the whole question of “meats” as a voluntary concession to the “weak brother.” *Although not* under obligation to abstain, he and his will do so to avoid putting a stumbling-block in a brother's way (1 Cor. 8 : 8-13; Rom. 14 :

7. me: but contrariwise, when they saw that I had been °intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even
8. °as Peter with *the gospel* of the circumcision (for he that °wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles);
9. and when they perceived the °grace that was given unto me, °James and Cephas and °John, they who <sup>1</sup>were

<sup>1</sup> Or, *are*

14-17). On the real occasion and significance of the "decrees" see Introduction, p. 12, and Appended Note B.

7. **Intrusted.** Cf. the use of the same figure in Rom. 3:2; 2 Tim. 1:12, 14. Apostleship itself is to Paul only the highest of the "gifts of the Spirit" (Eph. 4:11). Peter's and his own rest therefore on the same basis, not an appointment even by Jesus, but "the works of an apostle" "wrought for" the evangelist by divine power (ver. 8; 2 Cor. 12:12).

**As Peter.** The change from "Cephas" to the Greek name more natural to Paul's readers may be due to the fact that in ver. 7b-8 they are more directly in view. The later conception of apostleship connected it with the earthly ministry of Jesus (Acts 1:21, 22), and thus inevitably tended to place Paul's on a lower plane than Peter's; cf. Mt. 28:19; Lk. 24:47-49; Acts 1:8; 10:1-11:18; 15:7.

8. **Wrought** (Gr. "energized") **for Peter.** A similar comparison of God's "energizing" for Peter and for Paul is traceable in the structure of Acts, but not on equal terms.

9. **Grace given unto me.** I.e., the spiritual endowment (*charisma*) of apostleship, recognizable in "the signs of an apostle." These included "signs and wonders and mighty works" as well as more commonplace evidences of a "calling" to the work. (See on ver. 8 and cf. 2 Cor. 12:12.)

**James and Cephas.** Later scribes alter to "Peter and James and John," attempting to accommodate Paul's indication of relative rank in the Jerusalem church to that derived by them from the Synoptic Gospels. In reality the brother of Jesus was a more commanding figure in Jewish-Christian circles than any of the apostles.

**John.** The only New Testament mention of this apostle's name outside the Synoptic writings and Revelation. His enumeration among the "pillars" tends to justify the shadowy connection with Peter effected by "Luke" (Lk. 22:8; Acts 3:1, 3, 4, 11; 4:13, 19; 8:14), and shows that the martyr fate had not yet befallen him which is predicted for him in conjunction with his brother James in Mk. 10:39, and

reputed to be <sup>o</sup>pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the <sup>o</sup>right hands of fellowship, that <sup>o</sup>we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision; only *they would* that we should <sup>o</sup>remember the poor; which very thing <sup>o</sup>I was also zealous to do.

referred to in a recently discovered fragment of Papias (*ca.* 150 A.D.). Outside the group of late Ephesian writings more or less plausibly attributed to "John," and the traditions traceable to these, we have almost nothing on which to base a judgment of his character. The only incident in which he plays a separate rôle (Mk. 9 : 38-40) is one which draws upon him and the rest of the Twelve Jesus' rebuke for their narrow intolerance. The only one wherein he appears with James, outside the request for the places of honor in the kingdom (Mk. 10 : 35-45), is another rebuke for a narrow and vindictive spirit (Lk. 9 : 54-56). At the period of which Paul speaks (*ca.* 50 A.D.) John's conception of his apostolic calling is at all events still limited to "the circumcision." This extremely meagre mention of the "Son of Thunder" (Mk. 3 : 17) in the period antecedent to Revelation is hardly compatible with any far-reaching activity on his part during Paul's lifetime.

**Pillars.** Principal supports of the building. *Cf.* the figure in Rev. 3 : 12. Clement of Rome and Ignatius use the same comparison.

**Right hands of fellowship.** A current expression (here no doubt accompanied by the visible act) betokening a brotherly covenant.

**We should go . . . and they.** This is not a decision enacted on behalf of Barnabas and Paul by the Jerusalem authorities, as in Acts, but an agreement between equals. On the questions settled and the question left unsettled by the conference see Appended Note B.

**10. Remember the poor.** The form of the request is general, as if involving only the universal duty of alms-giving (one of the chief "acts of righteousness" in Jewish morality). This however is merely a periphrase to avoid the direct request of alms for their own community. For the Pauline Epistles show a proportion of effort bestowed on the raising and transmission to Jerusalem of a great fund for the relief of poverty in the *mother community*, which would be unaccountable without some such agreement as the present understood as applying locally; (Rom. 15 : 25-28, 31; 1 Cor. 16 : 1-4; 2 Cor. 8 : 1-9; 15; 12 : 14-18). It became indeed so prominent in Paul's work as to furnish one of the chief occasions of "blame" against him (2 Cor. 8 : 20), and, probably for this reason among others, is suppressed in Luke's account of the great journey of "ministration" (Rom. 15 : 25, 31; 1 Cor. 8 : 4; 9 : 1; *cf.* Acts 11 : 29, 12 : 25).

**I was also zealous to do.** The tense of the verb (aorist) does not

11. But <sup>o</sup>when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him  
 12. to the face, because <sup>o</sup>he stood condemned. For before  
 that <sup>o</sup>certain came from James, he did eat with the  
 Gentiles: but when they came, he drew back and  
 13. separated himself, fearing them that were of the cir-  
 cumcision. And the rest of the Jews <sup>o</sup>dissembled  
 likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was  
 14. carried away with their <sup>o</sup>dissimulation. But when I

admit a determination of the date at which Paul began the great work which culminated with the fatal journey. It might even be rendered "had been," implying a certain basis for the statement of Acts 11 : 27-30. From 1 Cor. 16 : 1-4 it is apparent that the beginning was early, probably forthwith after the suggestion by the "pillars." A beginning previous to the date of Paul's separation from Barnabas (Acts 15 : 39) is made improbable by the use of the singular, "we should remember . . . I was zealous."

(2) *The rupture caused by Peter's inconsistent conduct at Antioch,*  
 2 : 11-21.

11. **When Cephas came to Antioch.** Probably while Paul and Barnabas were in Galatia. See Appended Note B. The question on what basis the Jewish Christian shall hold table fellowship with his Gentile brother is necessarily subsequent to that whether the latter shall be recognized at all. Hence the incident is certainly later than that of ver. 1-10. But how much later? In ver. 12 Paul is confronted with a condition of affairs in Antioch such as could scarcely grow up without protest save in his absence. It is reasonable to infer that Peter's visit to this church occupied in part the period of absence of its two great leaders. See Appended Note B.

**He stood condemned.** *I.e.*, self-condemned by his inconsistency; cf. ver. 18. See Introduction, p. 36, for the anti-Pauline representation of this encounter.

12. **Certain came from James.** Of this delegation sent from Jerusalem to Antioch we have no information outside the present reference. It does seem to imply, however, a basis for Luke's account of the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem and its "decrees." See Appended Note B.

13. **Dissembled . . . dissimulation.** Paul uses the strong term "dissimulation" (Gr. "hypocrisy"), because, as appears from ver. 15-16, to his mind Peter and the rest were false to their fundamental Christian principles. Later and cooler reflection must have convinced Paul himself that he did them injustice. To reason from the knowledge "that a man is not justified by works of law but only by faith

saw that they walked <sup>o</sup>not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas <sup>o</sup>before *them* all, If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how <sup>o</sup>compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

15. We being Jews by nature, and not <sup>o</sup>sinners of the

---

in Christ," that therefore it is "making void the grace of God" to seek to have all the credit one can from works of law, might be logical for one who had had Paul's religious experience, but it could not be expected to convince men like Peter and Barnabas; and it certainly did not convince the succeeding generation. Paul's own silence as to the outcome at Antioch, the subsequent dissociation of his work from Antiochian support (Phil. 4 : 15), and above all the definite solution of the questions officially communicated by Luke, show that Pauline logic remained less cogent with the Church than Petrine authority. Ultimately the practical experience of the Church, combined with the dwindling proportion and influence of Jewish believers, led to the relaxation of the demands of James. In "Asia" ca. 95 A.D. the "burden" is restricted to abstinence "from fornication and things offered to idols" (Rev. 2 : 20, 24). The early Syrian church manual called the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (ca. 120) explicitly makes abstinence from meats optional except such as have been offered to idols; "for it is the worship of dead gods" (*Didache*, vi. 3). Finally, the second century recension of Acts transforms the "decrees" into merely moral requirements. But this late return to a purely Pauline standpoint came only with the extinction of the Jewish-Christian element in the Church.

14. **Not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel.** See the preceding note, beginning.

**Before them all.** The wrong done to Gentile believers had been public. Paul felt that its effects could only be arrested by equally public protest.

**Compellest the Gentiles to live as do the Jews.** The whole point of the charge lies in the fact that it is a breach of the fundamental spirit of the Jerusalem agreement of mutual non-interference. Those who would invert the order of 2 : 1-10 and 11-21 must explain why it should be regarded as heinous for Peter merely by clinging to his Jewish mode of life among Gentile believers to induce them also to adopt it.

*How the Pauline believer of Jewish birth "became as without law,"* ver. 15-21.

Opinion is divided on the question whether the argument of ver. 15-21 is a report of what Paul actually said to Peter at Antioch, or

16. Gentiles, yet <sup>°</sup>knowing that a man is not justified by <sup>1</sup>the works of the law, <sup>2</sup>save through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law: <sup>°</sup>because by the <sup>°</sup>works of the law shall

Ps. 143 : 2

<sup>1</sup> Or, *works of law*<sup>2</sup> Or, *but only*

whether the direct address ends with ver. 14, and 15-21 represents an explanation, addressed to the Galatians, of the Paulinists' attitude. The truth probably lies between the two. Direct address to the Galatians seems to begin markedly with 3 : 1. On the other hand we have no other example of so long a quotation by Paul from his own words, nor does the argument employ the "thou" of ver. 14, nor suggest in its mystical theologizing so much what Peter could really assent to, as what justifies Paul in his own present consciousness. We conclude that Paul is using the privilege of the ancient historian to present the substance of a past address in a form adapted to the general enlightenment of his present readers on the subject. The distinction is indicated in the text by spacing.

15. **Sinners of the Gentiles.** Paul assumes the point of view of an unconverted Jew, to whom the Gentiles are not so much "transgressors" (Gr. *parabatai*), which would imply conscious resistance to a clearly perceived moral requirement (so ver. 18), as "sinners" (Gr. *hamartoloi*), *i.e.*, men out of harmony with the moral ideal, known or unknown. In the parable Lk. 12 : 47-48 they correspond to the "servant which knew not his Lord's will."

16. **Knowing** (*i.e.*, because we knew) **that a man is not justified by works of law** (so alternate rendering). The divergence from the type of teaching attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels is more a matter of form than of substance. It is true this theological language might fall somewhat strangely on the ears of Peter, and he and other personal followers of Jesus might well be tempted to resent an attempt by Paul to prove them inconsistent with their Master's teaching. Nevertheless the real consistency was on Paul's side and not on theirs. The essence of Jesus' teaching had been to substitute his "easy yoke" for the "grievous burdens" of the scribes. To trust the "Friend of publicans and sinners" was to seek access to the heavenly Father by the road of the Prodigal and not that of the "elder brother." On the Pauline Doctrine of Justification see Appended Note C. Meantime it should be remembered that, while Paul's theological phraseology comes from the schools, his underlying conflict against legalism is the same as that waged by Jesus. **Because by works of law shall no flesh be justified.** The expressions are bor-

17. no flesh be justified. But if, while we sought to be justified in Christ, we ourselves also were found sinners, is Christ a <sup>o</sup>minister of sin? <sup>o</sup>God forbid.

---

rowed (with free adaptation) from Ps. 143 : 2. **Works of law.** The observance of injunctions, Mosaic or other. The distinction of Christian ethics, as Paul perceived, is not a matter of the number of its precepts, whether more or fewer than Moses'; nor in the greater or less requirement; but in the ideal presented—to have the disposition of the heavenly Father. This alone makes men sons of God (Mt. 5 : 45; cf. Eph. 5 : 1; Rom. 8 : 14). The argument itself implies of course that in this verse the alternative renderings must be preferred to the text of R. V.

17. An inference of the objector, to which Paul opposes a strong expletive (Anglice, God forbid). The expression is customary with him in protest against false deduction (Rom. 3 : 4, 6, 31; 6 : 2, 15; 7 : 7, 13; 9 : 14; 11 : 1, 11; etc.). The opponent cannot see how the gospel of Paul can have any other effect with Jews than their moral degradation to the level of heathenism. If the Jew be taught that for justification in Christ (see Appended Note C) he must first cut loose for good and all from that law which to his mind alone gives Israel its moral superiority (Ex. 33 : 16; Dt. 4 : 6-8), his new faith will tend to demoralization. It will make Christ "a minister of sin." This is the "slanderous report" of Paul's teaching referred to in Rom. 3 : 8, which Paul repudiates. Becoming "as without law" the Pauline Christian of Jewish birth is yet "not without law to God, but under law to Christ," a law of loving service (5 : 14, 6 : 2, Rom. 13 : 8-10) which gladly imitates the spirit of the heavenly Father as shown in Christ (Eph. 4 : 31-5 : 2), and is thus identical with "the righteousness of God" defined in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5 : 43-48 = Lk. 6 : 27-36). To this objection Paul returns in 5 : 13-6 : 10.

**God forbid.** The question arises, What is negatived in the repudiation of the inference "Christ a minister of sin"? Is it one of the premises; or is it the justice of the deduction? The Greek admits either, according to accentuation. Paul's mode of reasoning, however, both here and in Romans, and the "boastful" expression "sinners of the Gentiles," with which he had (almost ironically) placed himself at the Jews' point of view at the outset, requires the latter understanding. Yes, we do require to cut loose from the law if we would be justified by faith in Christ; and yes, we thus are "found sinners," no better than Gentiles. But are we to infer that it is our faith in Christ which has made us such? Far from it. We were so all the time, as even Scripture itself subtly indicates.

18. For if I <sup>o</sup>build up again those things which I destroyed, I prove myself a transgressor.  
 19. For <sup>o</sup>I through <sup>1</sup> the law <sup>o</sup>died unto <sup>1</sup> the law, that

<sup>1</sup> Or, *law*

18-19. The two "fors" are at first confusing. To treat ver. 18 as merely parenthetic would simplify; for manifestly ver. 19 presents the true inference to be drawn from the premiss, 'Faith in Christ involves abandonment of the law.' But Paul has two inferences, the one self-stultifying, the other true, which he wishes to set in contrast. The former is that of his opponents, who have just given in the person of Peter an evidence of the inherent inconsistency of their attitude. It is needless for him to pursue this inference further than the *impasse* into which its distinguished leader has brought himself by his attempt to

18. **Build up again those things which he (I) destroyed.** The reference is of course to the distinctions of the law regarded as lifting the Jew to a plane of ceremonial purity above the Gentile. Paul applies this figure of tearing down a wall similarly in Eph. 2 : 14, where the allusion is to the stone barrier in the temple excluding Gentiles from the court of Israel, broken down, as Paul holds, by the death of Christ. By attempting to rebuild this after having once destroyed it Peter proves himself not merely a "sinner," but a wilful "transgressor." (See on ver. 15.)

*Why, for Paul, abandonment of the law cannot lead to sin, 2 : 19-21.*

19. I. Strongly emphatic in the Greek. "I for my part."

**Died . . . that I might live.** This paradox is the fundamental thing in Paul's religious system (*cf.* Rom. 6-8), and indicates how completely his "gospel" sprang from his personal religious experience. For this reason it was the more difficult to apprehend. To many it seemed "veiled" (2 Cor. 4 : 3). Paul's moral struggle had resulted in a despair which he can compare to nothing else but "death." The comparison is something more than mere figure of speech, because in Paul's case (treated as normal in Rom. 7) the moral "death" is brought about by the discovery "through the law" that the inherent disposition of "flesh" to sin is in all the race of Adam stronger than the "law of the mind," and this invariably leads to death. A longer or shorter period of delay may intervene, as in Adam's case, but sin, the "sting" of death, is a poison in the blood ultimately working physical death; though God "created man for immortality."<sup>1</sup> The remedy is the infusion, by the grace of God, of "the mind of the Spirit," which as an antidote counteracts the

<sup>1</sup> Wisd. of Solomon 1 : 13-16; 2 : 23, 24. Cf. 2 Cor. 5 : 5.

20. I might live unto God. I have been crucified with Christ; <sup>1</sup> yet I live; *and yet* no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that *life* which I now live in the flesh I live in <sup>°</sup>faith, *the faith* which is in the Son of God, 21. <sup>°</sup>who loved me, and gave himself up for me. I do not

<sup>1</sup> Or, *and it is no longer I that live, but Christ &c.*

poison, "quicken even your mortal bodies." The proof and example of this is the resurrection of Jesus, in whose case, because he "knew no sin," but was on the contrary the complete embodiment of the Spirit, even the body was miraculously transformed into a body of "glory," exemplifying the change ultimately to be accomplished for all who receive the adoption of the same Spirit, and foreshadowing the accompanying deliverance even of the creation itself, which "awaits the manifestation of the sons of God" (Rom. c. 8; 12 : 1, 2; Phil. 3 : 10-12, 21; 1 Cor. 15 : 21-23, 35-54). In the briefest possible form this whole mystical theory of redemption is embodied in the sentence "I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God."

20. A more specific restatement of the principle of ver. 19, to show its bearing on the present case. Paul's gospel does not promote sin, for the act of faith (filial trust) by which "the Lord the Spirit" is appropriated, comparable (at least in Paul's case), in its agony of separation from the law and all the hopes of righteousness it could offer, to the death which the law had inflicted upon Jesus as a malefactor, in the nature of the case involves a "walking after this Spirit" (Rom. 8 : 3-9).

**Faith which is in** (Gr. "of") **the Son of God.** Filial trust which rests upon the revelation of the glorified Redeemer. The title "Son of God" is appropriate to the cosmic grandeur of the conception. See Appended Note C.

**Who loved me, and gave himself up for me.** Paul's universalism involves the lifting of the simple story of Jesus, the Friend of Sinners, who by his undaunted championship of the right of this outcast class to full "sonship" in "the kingdom" had incurred the fate of impalement, to the cosmic plane. The tragedy is no longer viewed as local and specific. It is the drama of a world-redemption. Every "sinner," even "sinners of the Gentiles," may thus appropriate the love of God in Christ. The way of sacrifice, once conceived as Jesus' "setting his face steadfastly to go up to Jerusalem," assumes larger, even cosmic, dimensions. The Redeemer descended from highest heaven to nethermost hell. "Though he was in the form of God he took upon him the form of a servant and became obedient unto death,

---

make void the grace of God: for if righteousness is through <sup>1</sup> the law, then Christ died for nought.

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *law*

---

even the death of the cross" (Phil. 2 : 5-11; *cf.* Gal. 4 : 4-5; 2 Cor. 8 : 9; and see Appended Note A).

21. A reënforcement of Paul's minor premiss, which might also seem somewhat open to question. What call for the death of Christ if redemption could be had without? The syllogism is as follows:

Major premiss: All endeavor to be justified by works of the law is hopeless.

Minor premiss: Supplementation of faith by even partial return to Mosaism is also such an endeavor; for it implies distrust of the adequacy of mere "grace," and thus "makes it void."

Conclusion: The gospel of the Judaizers is a counsel of despair.



II. DOCTRINAL ARGUMENT, AND APPEAL AGAINST RE-ACTION. PAUL PROVES TO THE GALATIANS, FROM THEIR EXPERIENCE OF THE SPIRIT, THAT THEY THEMSELVES, AND NOT THE LITERAL DESCENDANTS OF ABRAHAM, NOR SUCH AS SEEK JUSTIFICATION BY WORKS OF THE LAW, ARE THE TRUE SONS OF GOD AND HEIRS OF THE PROMISES OF SCRIPTURE. HE CONTRASTS THE FREEDOM AND ZEAL OF THEIR CONDITION UNDER GRACE WITH THE BONDAGE OF JUDAISM, AND WARNS THEM OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF ACCEPTING ITS YOKE.

3 : 1-5 : 12

1. *The Abrahamic inheritance is shown to be a prerogative of those who have faith in Christ Jesus,* 3 : 1-29

3 : 1

3. O foolish <sup>o</sup>Galatians, <sup>o</sup>who did bewitch you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was <sup>o</sup>openly set forth crucified?

---

GENERAL PROPOSITION: *The messianic gift of the Spirit is alone fundamental. This did not come as a result of legalism, but of faith,*  
3 : 1-5.

1. Paul now turns to the Galatians themselves in direct address. *Galatians* is the only term by which the mixed population of Lycaonians, Pisidians, Romans, Greeks, Jews, and Anatolians in the cities of Acts 13 : 14-14 : 24 could be addressed with courtesy. "Phrygians" would have been opprobrious.

**Who did bewitch you?** A figure of speech to express the unaccountableness of their folly. The "evil eye" (Mk. 7 : 22) was supposed to exert the fascination of a serpent which "charms" a bird. Some such fascination must have blinded the Galatians, else the spectacle of Jesus Christ crucified by the very legalism to which they are now invited must have deterred them.

**Openly set forth.** Gr. "placarded." In Rom. 3 : 25 God makes

2. °This only would I learn from you, Received ye the Spirit by <sup>1</sup>the °works of the law, or by the °<sup>2</sup>hearing of  
 3. faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit,  
 4. <sup>3</sup>are ye now perfected in the flesh? °Did ye suffer so  
 5. many things in vain? °if it be indeed in vain. °He

<sup>1</sup> Or, *works of law*   <sup>2</sup> Or, *message*   <sup>3</sup> Or, *do ye now make an end in the flesh?*

a votive spectacle of Jesus “in his blood.” Jn. 3 : 14 adds a comparison to the brazen serpent (Num. 21 : 8, 9). Here the reference is to Paul’s own preaching, which made the cross central (1 Cor. 2 : 2). See Appended Note C.

2. **This only.** Paul knows that he can “rest his case” on this single issue. He had done so with complete success at Jerusalem (2 : 9; Acts 15 : 8, 12; cf. 10 : 44-47; 11 : 15-18). There was no escape from it; for the mother church itself dated its own foundation from the same phenomenon. The fundamental confession which made Christianity a religion was: “Jesus is Lord.” It rested upon this experience as its proof (Acts 2 : 33; Eph. 4 : 7-10). Jewish messianism anticipated the “outpouring of the Spirit” in the last days as the token of the Redeemer’s advent. For legalists this was the spirit of obedience to the law; for the ‘Wisdom’ writers the spirit of ‘wisdom,’ for apocalypticists the spirit of ‘prophecy’ (Joel 2 : 28-32; cf. Num. 11 : 29). The appearance of these “gifts of the Spirit” upon “faith in Christ Jesus,” including the “signs and wonders” (Joel 2 : 30), was the proof on which the Church itself rested its assurance that “God hath made this Jesus . . . both Lord and Christ.” If the Gentiles also had had “the gifts of the Spirit” there was no more to be said. The only point to be made clear was *when* the gifts came, i.e., *not* upon this attempt to supplement by **works of the law** their justification in grace, but *before* it, at the time of their **hearing** (productive) of faith.

3-4. Paul digresses to a brief *reductio ad absurdum*: This is a kind of progress which starts from the higher and proceeds to the lower; from the strong and eternal to the weak and ephemeral. God’s method is the reverse (1 Cor. 15 : 46).

4. **Did ye suffer.** In biblical use the verb has invariably the connotation of evil; not merely “did ye experience?” Of the churches of South Galatia (not of Galatia proper) we know that they had “endured a great fight of affliction” (Acts 13 : 50-51; 14 : 2, 5, 19, 22; 2 Tim. 3 : 11).

If it be indeed “in vain.” Paul qualifies his strong expression, which would imply a greater hopelessness than he really feels in their case; cf. 4 : 11.

therefore that supplieth to you the Spirit, and <sup>o</sup>worketh <sup>1</sup>miracles <sup>2</sup>among you, *doeth he it* by <sup>3</sup>the works of the law, or by the <sup>4</sup>hearing of faith?

6. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. <sup>5</sup>Know therefore that

Gen. 15 : 6

<sup>1</sup> Gr. *powers*. <sup>2</sup> Or, *in* <sup>3</sup> Or, *works of law* <sup>4</sup> Or, *message* <sup>5</sup> Or, *Ye perceive*

5. **He therefore**, etc. A return to the point laid down in ver. 2. The "therefore" is resumptive, "Well, then, to return." We learn now more specifically what Paul meant by "Received ye the Spirit?"

Worketh miracles among you (better "worketh miraculous power *in you*"; see alternative rendering). The starting-point of the New Testament argument from "miracles" is not with those wrought by Jesus, but those of the writers' own time. They have "the gift of miracles," and account for it by the working of God who "supplies the Spirit" in response to faith. Jesus' miracles had been similar. Paul, who but rarely refers to miracles of his own (2 Cor. 12 : 12), never refers to any wrought by Jesus. "Miracle" has not disappeared from modern experience of the Spirit except as a matter of interpretation. The phenomena have not ceased; but our idea of their causation has changed in accordance with the modern conception of "natural law" as the mode of the divine operation. That which to the modern is accountable by natural causation, *including under this head the tendency of report to exaggerate*, to the ancient was accountable only as the interposition of a superhuman being (divine, angelic, or demonic). Our definition of the New Testament term "miracle" must therefore be: A surprising occurrence *interpreted as* due to the intervention of a personal superhuman being, in response to human appeal, athwart the observed course of nature. As *thus interpreted* the restoration to consciousness of Eutychus, after a fall "from the third story" (Acts 20 : 7-12), is a "miracle." It was such to Luke, and possibly may have been to Paul, though to the modern it may be only a more or less surprising and providential occurrence. But of the conviction of Paul that the surprising phenomena of "tongues," "healings," "helps," and "miracles," which were often found to accompany acceptance of the new "faith," were in the strictest sense "supernatural," there cannot be the slightest question. The only surprising thing about this conviction is its sobriety. For Paul's ethical sense leads him to insist on the subordination of all such mere external "manifestations of the Spirit," as destined to "cease" and be "done away" before the deeper and more abiding gifts (1 Cor. c. 13).

they which be of faith, <sup>o</sup>the same are sons of Abraham.

8. And <sup>o</sup>the scripture, foreseeing that God <sup>1</sup>would justify the <sup>2</sup>Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham, *saying*, <sup>o</sup>In thee shall all the nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith <sup>o</sup>are blessed with the faithful Abraham.

Gen. 12:3;  
18:18<sup>1</sup> Gr. *justifieth*.    <sup>2</sup> Gr. *nations*.

(1) *The Abrahamic promise universal, and based on faith*, 3 : 6-9.

The very man through whom the Jews claim to be "heirs of the world" was given this distinction by God (Rom. 4 : 13) on the ground not of works of the law (for his circumcision came afterward, Rom. 4 : 10), but of faith alone, ver. 6-9.

6. The remarkable statement of Gen. 15 : 6 (J, E), *preceding* Gen. 17 : 10-14 (P), gives Paul a redoubtable argument against the Judaizers, which he develops at much greater length in Rom. c. 4.

7. **The same.** Strongly emphatic. "It is *these* (not the literal descendants) who are," etc. The point at issue is that of Philo's celebrated treatise (*ca.* 30 A.D.), "Who is the Heir of the Things of God?" According to the Judaizers, those who become "sons of Abraham" by entering into the covenant of adoption prescribed in Gen. 17 : 10-14, an implied assumption of the "yoke of the law." According to Paul those who by Abraham's faith become the sons of God, and thus also his "heirs." See the Q. E. D. in 4 : 7.

8. **The scripture . . . preached the gospel beforehand.** Paul shares the rabbinic theory of his time of a mysterious meaning miraculously embodied in "scripture" without the knowledge of the writers themselves (1 Pt. 1 : 11; 1 Cor. 9 : 9-10). It is further developed in ver. 16 and 4 : 21-31. It does not proceed, however, to the extent denounced in Jn. 5 : 37-40, nor to the extravagances of post-apostolic allegorical exegesis.

**In thee shall all the nations be blessed.** In the Hebrew original at first only a magnification of the greatness of Abraham's endowment. The surrounding peoples will say, "God bless us, as he has done with Abraham," using his name proverbially in blessing (see alternate rendering to Gen. 22 : 18 and *cf.* 48 : 20). The more generous interpretation that the Gentiles shall not merely invoke, but receive, blessing through Abraham is applicable in later prophecy, especially Deutero-Isaiah. To Paul the passage is "prophetic" of Gentile redemption by the same means as Abraham, *i.e.*, faith.

9. **Are blessed.** Declared, or treated, as blessed in company with Abraham. Further elaboration of the thought in ver. 16, 28-29.

10. For as many as are of <sup>1</sup>the works of the law are under a curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written in the book  
 Dt. 27 : 26

11. of the law, to do them. Now that no man is justified <sup>2</sup>by the law in the sight of God, is evident: for, The  
 Hab. 2 : 4

12. righteous shall live by faith; and the law is not of faith; but, He that doeth them shall live in them.  
 Lev. 18 : 5

<sup>1</sup> Or, *works of law*    <sup>2</sup> Gr. *in*

(2) *The law brings not blessing, but curse, 3 : 10-12.*

10. Paul takes a world-wide view of redemption. Its historic stages to his mind are three only: (1) Adam, in consequence of whose fault the birthright of humanity to dominion (Gen. 1 : 26) and eternal life (Gen. 6 : 3; cf. Wisdom of Sol. 2 : 23) was lost; (2) Abraham, in consequence of whose faith it was conditionally restored; (3) Christ, through whose victory and gift of the Spirit believers enter upon the inheritance. The Mosaic dispensation of law was a temporary expedient adapted to special requirements; it merely "came in alongside" (Rom. 5 : 20; cf. ver. 19-22 below). To prove that the law is not a superior prerogative of the "holy seed" enabling them as "sons" who know and "do the will" of the Creator to secure the "inheritance" to the exclusion of others, Paul advances the startling paradox that the law results always and only in "curse," and was so intended! See Appended Note C.

11. By stressing the word "all" in his quotation from the law (Dt. 27 : 26) Paul had given to the Old Testament requirement a severity and strictness his opponents were far from conceding (cf. 5 : 3; 6 : 13). The only way, after this, to give his contention verisimilitude was to point out the "way of escape," as having been intimated even before the coming of Christ. This intimation Paul finds not only in the gospel of faith "preached beforehand to Abraham," but in the prophets, notably the passage from Hab. 2 : 4. "His soul (the wicked man's) is puffed up, it is not upright in him; but the just shall live by his faith" (alternative rendering "in his faithfulness"). The exegesis is manifestly forced, but the antithesis seemed to Paul to contrast the "boasting" of the Jew (Rom. 3 : 27; 4 : 2), the spirit of Pharisaic self-righteousness, with the "righteousness of God" preached by Jesus.

12. Lev. 18 : 5 is quoted (appropriately) as exhibiting the spirit of Mosaism in contrast with the evangelic. Again the word "doeth" must be taken in an extreme sense, to reach the conclusion aimed at (ver. 21). The law brings only *death*, never life.

Dt. 21 : 23

13. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus; that we might receive <sup>o</sup>the promise of the Spirit through faith.

(3) *Redemption from the curse of the Law explains the Cross*, ver. 13-14.

13. Paul delights in paradox. His opponents having taken their stand on the blessing given to Abraham as conditioned on obedience to the law, he aims to show that it is precisely in the removal of this alleged condition that the messianic blessing consists. For the death of Christ, already referred to as the divine provocative of faith (see on 1 : 4; 2 : 19-21 and Appended Note C), was in its very manner defiant of the law and thus indicative of the liberation intended. Not only did Jesus incur death as the champion of "sinners," but the very mode of his martyrdom was a form of death, and the only one, which the law pronounces "accursed" (Dt. 21 : 23).

14. The Q. E. D. of arguments (1) and (2). Christ's death, and more particularly the special form of his death, proves that the promise to Abraham was not nationalistic in application but universal, and that obedience to the law is not the condition of inheriting it, but rather relinquishment of Pharisaic self-righteousness, in filial "faith."

**The promise of the Spirit.** *I.e.*, the promise whose content is the Spirit. See on ver. 2 and below on ver. 21. Originally the promise had been "this land" (Gen. 15 : 7-21). The decline of national hopes had led to a gradual spiritualization and universalization of this outlook (*cf.* Heb. 11 : 8-10, 13-15; Acts 7 : 5). "Prophecy," after Israel's national existence had been merged in that of great world empires, became "apocalypse," which deals with cosmic readjustments. "Wisdom," equally universalistic, bases hope for the world on anthropological and sociological transformation. This involves a "spiritualizing" interpretation of "the promise" for which the minds of devout Israelites were amply prepared, especially in the Dispersion, and most of all at Alexandria. *Cf.* the spiritualization in Acts 7 : 2-16. With Paul the promise is simply "sonship," which involves "heirship" over God's creation, and "life." These all result from the outpouring of the Spirit of adoption (4 : 5-7; Rom. 8 : 15-17).

(4) *Impossibility of the law having been meant as a condition of the promise, and of distinctions of race among the heirs*, 3 : 15-29.

**STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES:** (a) *Covenants do not admit of subsequent alteration of the terms.* (b) *The promise in question was put in a form adapted to universal, not particularistic application*, 3 : 15-16.

15. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: Though it be but <sup>o</sup>a man's <sup>1</sup>covenant, yet when it hath been confirmed, no one maketh it void, or addeth thereto.

16. Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, <sup>o</sup>and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

17. <sup>o</sup>Now this I say; A <sup>1</sup>covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came <sup>o</sup>four hundred and thirty

Gen. 12:7;  
13:15;  
17:7;  
22:18;  
24:7

Ex. 12:40

<sup>1</sup> Or, *testament*

15. The Abrahamic promise was a formal "covenant" (Gen. 15: 8-18). Subsequent imposition of conditions in such cases are regarded as dishonorable even for a **man** (Ps. 15: 4).

16. **And to his seed.** The Judaizers propose to exclude the younger son (*cf.* 4: 22-28) from a share in the inheritance (4: 17), by treating the law as its condition. Paul argues (by a piece of rabbinic subtlety issuing in ver. 28) that if this had been the intention the covenant in its language would have employed a plural, "seeds," and not the singular, "seed," because admittedly (?) the Gentiles have some part in it (ver. 8), and if any distinction of race be made among the heirs a plural would be necessary rather than a collective. The singular therefore has a subtle, deep significance. It must be understood in a sense comprehensive of all; and this can be the case only when we think of it as referring to Christ, who like a "second Adam" is "the head of every man" (1 Cor. 11: 3; Eph. 1: 22; 4: 15; Col. 1: 18; 2: 19). In reality the Hebrew collective term "seed" is used precisely as the English would be. The argument has no force unless we admit — as was admitted in Paul's time — that meanings may be validly drawn from Scripture which were not intended or realized by the writer.

17. **Now this I say.** Better, "This is what I mean." So 4: 1. Having stated (ver. 15, 16) his two propositions: (1) the law not a condition; (2) the heirs not plural, Paul now proceeds to develop them in ver. 17-24 and 25-29 respectively.

*For what purpose the law was really given, (a) not as a condition limiting the promise, 3: 17-18.*

17. **Four hundred and thirty years after.** The number 430 is taken from Ex. 12: 40, 41, but does not include the lives of Isaac and Jacob. In Gen. 15: 13, the passage here interpreted, the coming into the inheritance is reckoned as occurring roundly 400 years after. There is confusion which resulted in two different reckonings current in Paul's time, but it is immaterial to Paul's argument,

years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance is of the law, it is no more of promise: but God hath granted it to Abraham by promise. <sup>o</sup>What then is the law? <sup>o</sup>It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made; and *it was* <sup>o</sup>ordained through angels <sup>o</sup>by the hand of a

18. Emphasis laid on the evangelic nature of the “gospel” preached beforehand to Abraham. The “covenant” was an act of “grace,” not “disannulled” by subsequent imposition of conditions.

(β) *The Law was really meant for a discipline to develop the heir,* 3 : 19-24.

19. **What then is the law?** Paul may well interject this question of amazement and incredulity in the mouth of his opponents; for the paradox he is about to propound is the most startling a Jew could well conceive.

**It was added because of** (Gr. “for the sake of”) **transgressions.** The English versions by no means do justice to the startling force of the Greek preposition, which implies nothing less than that it was the intended purpose of the law to *produce* transgressions. In what sense Paul could employ this paradoxical statement becomes apparent from the parallel in Rom. 5 : 13-20. The function of law in Paul’s philosophy of redemption is explained more fully in Appended Note C. As conscious and painful and involving “curse” the condition of a conscious “transgressor” to which man is brought by the incoming of law is an advance upon the mere state of innocence in that it paves the way for blessing.

**Ordained through angels.** In two further respects the law shows its merely incidental, temporary, and provisional character. Both parties were indirectly represented, instead of acting in person as in the original covenant (Gen. 15 : 17, 18; cf. Ex. 20 : 18-21; 24 : 3-8). The giving of the law “through angels” is a belief resting upon current interpretations of Dt. 33 : 2, which in combination with Ps. 68 : 11 was taken to identify the phenomena described in Ex. 19 : 18, 19; 20 : 18 as appearances of angels (cf. Ps. 104 : 4; Heb. 1 : 7). To Luke (Acts 7 : 38, 53), as to Josephus (*Antiq. XV.* v. 3) and the Jews generally, this only enhances the authority of the law. To Paul and his disciple, the writer of Hebrews (Heb. 1 : 2, 7-8, 13-14; 2 : 2, 3), it is a mark of inferiority. Israel is no more under the direct leadership of God than the other nations, whom God was believed to have committed each to the guardianship of its own “angel” (Dan. 10 : 13, 21; 12 : 1). Angelic guidance was

20. mediator. Now a mediator is not *a mediator* of one;  
 21. but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of

held to have been substituted for God's personal presence as a punishment for Israel's "stiff-neckedness" in the wilderness (Ex. 23 : 20-23; 33 : 2-4; cf. Acts 7 : 41-43). The standing reproach of Judaism on the part of Christians of the second century is in fact that it is a "worship of angels." See on 4 : 3, 8-9.

By (Gr. "in") the hand of a mediator. Moses' function in "mediating" for the people with God, plays a great part in the Old Testament representation (Ex. 20 : 19; Dt. 5 : 19-25, 18 : 16), in contemporary Jewish literature (Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 20; cf. *Assumptio Mosis* (ca. 40 A.D.) i. 14), and in Pauline (2 Cor. 3 : 7-4 : 6) and Deutero-Pauline writings of the New Testament (1 Tim. 2 : 5; Heb. 8 : 6; 9 : 15; 12 : 24). He alone beheld "the glory of God" (Ex. 33 : 17-23; 34 : 5-8), the people refused to draw nigh (20 : 18-19), and could not endure to see even the reflection of the "glory" from Moses' face (34 : 29-35). In 2 Cor. 3 : 7-4 : 6 Paul develops most poetically the contrast here merely suggested between the mediation of Moses and that of Christ. Ministers of the new covenant, though its "glory" far exceeds that of the "ministration of death" and "condemnation," are "not as Moses, who put a veil upon his face that the children of Israel might not look steadfastly. . . . We (ministers of the better covenant) with unveiled face reflect as mirrors the glory of the Lord (Jesus), being transfigured into the same likeness." For "God that said (at the first creation) Light shall shine out of darkness, shined (in the new creation) in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of 'the glory of God' in the face of Jesus Christ" (cf. Jn. 14 : 9).

20. A verse of extreme difficulty, for which Lightfoot counts "250 or 300" interpretations. The difficulty lies in the introduction of a new thought — the unity of God — not germane to the context, but in the judgment of some patristic interpreters intended to contrast the new covenant of Christianity as from the one God, with Judaism as from a multiplicity of angels. God required no go-between for his revelation (Christianity), because he "is one." That of the angels (Mosaism) required a "mediator," for they are many. If this be the intended sense the verse may be set down, even without manuscript evidence, as spurious; for however admirably this idea of Christianity mediated by God in person *vs.* Judaism as a "worship of angels" comports with second century patristic thought (see on 4 : 10), it is certain from the New Testament parallels cited (preceding note) that Moses is brought forward by Paul as appearing in behalf not of the angels, but of *the people*. If the verse be authentic, we can only hesitate between two general forms of interpretation, each open to

God? God forbid: "for if there had been a law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would 22. have been of the law. Howbeit the scripture <sup>o</sup>hath

serious objection. *a* (Lightfoot): Mediatorship implies a conditional relationship. Promise, as in the case of Abraham and Christ, "depends on the sole decree of God." But the former statement is hardly valid and the latter is in conflict with Paulinism (1 Tim. 2 : 5; Heb. 8 : 6; 9 : 15; 12 : 24). The whole could be far more simply expressed had Paul so intended. *b* (Zahn): Mediatorship implies a plurality in interest, "God is one," therefore the plurality must be on the other side, that of the heirs; but in the dispensation of grace the heir is one (ver. 16, 28). This accords better with the context, but would at least require us to read "But *Christ* is one," instead of the unnecessary truism "But God is one." The sense becomes clearest by simple omission of the verse.

21. The natural objection of the Judaizer to Paul's doctrine of "death" and "condemnation" as the object of the "ministration of Moses" is that it sets the two revelations of God in conflict with one another, an inference drawn in good faith by Marcion, the great Paulinist of the second century. Paul answers with an attempt to make good his extraordinary paradox that the object of the law was not to give life. *For if there had been a law given which could* (*i.e.*, such that it could) **make alive**. This is undermining the very centre of his opponents' position, the point in their view least in need of defence. It is in fact the explicit statement of the law that it is given to "make alive" (Dt. 30 : 15-20), and this is the very foundation principle of current Jewish orthodoxy (Mt. 19 : 16-19; 2 Esdras 14 : 30). We cannot wonder that Paul's arguments to disprove this provoked from his antagonists the accusation of "handling the word of God deceitfully" (2 Cor. 4 : 2). Only Paul's unyielding devotion to the faith of his childhood in the superhuman sanctity of the law (Rom. 7 : 12) can explain his resort to an interpretation so violent. The current assumption of his time, of a sense in Scripture transcending that intended by its writers, could give momentary plausibility to such interpretations.

22. A falling back upon the passages quoted in ver. 10-11. The real basis is broader. Paul expresses it by a word unknown to Hebrew literature, but vital to his system, a coinage of the Stoics, "conscience" (Rom. 2 : 15). **Hath shut up all things.** Not merely men and angels (1 Cor. 6 : 3), but even the impersonal creation, which now awaits with groaning the "incorruption" to be restored to it when the sons of God are manifested (Rom. 8 : 19-21).

shut up all things under sin, that <sup>o</sup>the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

23. But before <sup>1</sup> faith came, we were <sup>o</sup>kept in ward under the law, shut up unto <sup>o</sup>the faith which should afterwards 24. be revealed. So that the law hath been <sup>o</sup>our tutor *to bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. 25. But now that faith is come, <sup>o</sup>we are no longer under a 26. tutor. For <sup>o</sup>ye are all sons of God, through faith, <sup>o</sup>in 27. Christ Jesus. <sup>o</sup>For as many of you as were baptized

<sup>1</sup> Or, *the faith*

**The promise** — of Gen. 15 : 7, here interpreted as = “life” (ver. 21). See note on ver. 14.

23-24. Conclusion of Paul’s answer to the objection, “What then is the law?” (ver. 19).

**Kept in ward . . . our tutor.** The two comparisons do not present different aspects of the law (restraint, instruction) but the same, viz. the discipline of restraint and prohibition. The “tutor” (*pædagogus*) in ancient use was not an instructor, but merely a slave responsible for the child’s safety and good conduct. The words “to bring us” supplied in R. V. import somewhat more than the sense warrants. Paul is not concerned here with the light given by the law, but with its curse and bondage. Until we *were brought* “unto Christ” it was jailer and mentor.

**Faith . . . the faith.** The spirit of filial trust evoked by the spectacle of the cross; see on 1 : 23; 2 : 16.

(b) *Impossibility of distinctions between the heirs. The sonship is a common life*, 3 : 25-29.

25-26. **We . . . ye all.** The change of person indicates the transition from consideration of the Jewish believer (as in 2 : 15-16) to the Gentile. For all alike faith results in the same gift of “the Spirit” (ver. 2) giving assurance of sonship with all the heirship therein implied (4 : 6; cf. Rom. 8 : 15-17 and see note below).

**In Christ Jesus.** On the mystical sense of this phrase of Pauline coinage see above (note on 2 : 4) and the notes here following.

27. **For.** Ver. 27-28 explain the clause “in Christ Jesus” appended “so as to form in a manner a distinct proposition” (Lightfoot) at the end of ver. 26.

Baptism, which all alike have undergone, by its very symbolism of immersion, and its accompaniment of gifts of the Spirit, is the proof of this unity “in Christ.” The thought is more fully developed in

28. into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye <sup>o</sup>all are one

Rom. 6 : 3-11, where the fundamental significance of the rite as viewed by Paul is made apparent. Paul's ruling principle is that for redemption a new infusion of "spirit" is indispensable to emancipate flesh from the dominion of sin, and this divine operation of grace is absolutely conditioned upon the renunciation of all attempts at self-justification in a spirit of filial trust. In accordance with this principle baptism symbolizes for Paul always death and resurrection. The elements of this change are the cessation of life conceived as a self-centred activity, and the beginning of eternal life, which is "hid with Christ in God," and this not one's own, either in derivation or direction (2 : 20; 2 Cor. 5 : 15; Col. 2 : 12, 20; 3 : 1; Phil. 2 : 13; Rom. 12 : 2). The most essential "teaching of baptisms," therefore, is "repentance *from dead works* and faith toward God" (Heb. 6 : 1-2), since by this means we "put on Christ" (Eph. 4 : 23; Col. 3 : 9-11), whose all-surrounding, all-pervading Spirit is a "Red Sea" of grace in which all believers are baptized into mystic union with Christ, as the fathers "were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and the sea" (1 Cor. 10 : 2).

28. The Jewish prayer-book still contains a thanksgiving corresponding to that of the ancient Greek for not having been born a barbarian or a slave.

I thank thee that I was not born a Gentile.

I thank thee that I was not born a slave.

I thank thee that I was not born a woman.

Such distinctions "in Christ" are for Paul inadmissible. They are not merely wrong; they are non-existent. All alike, Jews and Gentiles, men and women, have renounced and terminated their life "in the flesh." So far as they have real life it is a life actually and really of the same substance with the life of Christ; for "spirit" is to Paul something far more real than mere influence. Christ is thus in a perfectly concrete sense "the head of every man." He is a "second Adam" in whom all are "made alive," and just as in Jewish speculation the first Adam was so representative of the common humanity as not even to share in the distinctions of sex, so in the "man from heaven" all distinctions of mere "flesh" will disappear.

**All one man.** The conclusion of the argument that the "seed" of Abraham is not a plurality, ver. 16. This "one new man" whose members are pervaded and unified by the life-giving flow of the Spirit, is described in Eph. 4 : 13-16. The arterial system, which at death is found empty of blood, was supposed in antiquity to afford circulation to air or "animal spirits."

29. *man* in Christ Jesus. And <sup>o</sup>if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.

2. *The Galatians are warned that their present apostasy is a return to bondage*, 4 : 1-5 : 12.

4. <sup>o</sup>But I say that so long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a bondservant, though he is <sup>o</sup>lord

29. **If ye are Christ's** (Gr. "of Christ"). We might render "members" or "parts of Christ." The unity is in Paul's view an actual participation in the life of God in Christ. This mystical conception, so real to his personal experience, justifies to his mind the belief that in the use of the collective singular "seed" instead of the plural "seeds" or some distributive of like sense, the Scripture was made to utter a mysterious 'prophecy' of Christ.

GENERAL PROPOSITION. *In its very nature as an adoption the gift of the Spirit is an emancipation for all mankind*, 4 : 1-7.

1. **But I say**, or "mean"; *i.e.*, "My proposition is this." Having completed in 3 : 6-29 his proof that the Abrahamic inheritance was intended for the spiritual "seed" who are "one" in Christ, Paul returns to his original postulate, his "only" appeal, 3 : 2-5, for the purpose of determining the nature of the "inheritance."

**Lord of all.** Contemporary writings, Jewish and Christian, leave no doubt whatever as to the assumed content of the "inheritance." Abraham was understood to have been literally, as Paul says, "made heir of the world" (Rom. 4 : 13). It had been created for Adam (Gen. 1 : 28; Ps. 8 : 5-7), but when Adam had evinced his unfitness, Abraham and his seed, including all faithful Israelites, were chosen to the exclusion of "sinners of the Gentiles" and disloyal Jews. "Esdras" (ca. 90 A.D.) complains, "O Lord, thou hast said that for our sakes thou madest this world. As for the other nations which also come of Adam, thou hast said (Is. 40 : 15) that they are nothing, and are like unto spittle. . . . And now, O Lord, behold these nations, which are reputed as nothing, be lords over us and devour us. But we, thy people whom thou hast called (Ex. 4 : 24) thy first-born, thy only begotten, . . . are given into their hands. If the world now be made for our sakes why do we not possess for an inheritance our world?" Christian expectations are not less, but greater. The "son" must "inherit the earth" (Mt. 5 : 5; 1 Cor. 3 : 22; Rev. 21 : 1, 7). If we "see not yet all things made subject unto him," Christ's triumph over the (demonic) powers which now control the world, including "him that hath the power of death" proves that he is henceforth expecting until his (invisible) enemies be made subject unto

---

2. of all; but is <sup>o</sup>under guardians and stewards until <sup>o</sup>the
3. term appointed of the father. So we also, when we were children, were held in bondage under the <sup>o<sup>1</sup></sup> rudi-

---

<sup>o</sup> Or, *elements*

---

him (1 Cor. 15 : 27; Heb. 2 : 8, 9). The object of creation which the Gentiles vainly inquire after, angels are ignorant of, and which Jews understand to have been their national benefit, is therefore revealed in the Church (Eph. 3 : 9-10), which takes the place in patristic thought of Israel as the heir of God. Its conflict accordingly is "not (like Israel's), against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6 : 12) who now struggle to prolong the dominion they have abused (1 Cor. 2 : 8), supplanting and subjecting the rightful heir. When the sons of God are manifested as God's adoptive heirs, the creation, delivered from its bondage to "vanity," will gladly revert to its intended owners, in spite of all that "death or life, angels or principalities, height or depth" can do to prevent it (Rom. 8 : 19-22, 38-39). Thus in "the adoption" will be made manifest "to every angel and spirit" the hidden purpose of the Creator (Eph. 3 : 9-11).

2. **Under guardians (of the person) and stewards (of the property).** Angelic "world-rulers" appointed to the guardianship of nations and direction of the cosmic forces, according to contemporary Jewish belief. The judgment of the angels (1 Cor. 6 : 3) for their maladministration of this trust it was believed would precede the general judgment of mankind. See on ver. 3.

**The term appointed.** Whether Roman, or Greek, or (more probably) some provincial legal practice of Galatia underlies Paul's figure is of minor importance. Also whether the father is conceived of as dead or not (*cf.* Heb. 9 : 16). Unlike certain Jewish liberals of his time in Alexandria, who considered only the "spiritual" sense of the law to be binding, Paul interpreted the obligation of the law as literally as any Palestinian rabbi, *until the death of Christ*.

3. **Rudiments** (better alternative rendering "elements," Gr. *stoicheia*) **of the world.** The sense of the word is not here inanimate simple rules, as in Heb. 5 : 12, but animate beings "which by nature are no gods" though mistaken for such (ver. 8), and which as "guardians and stewards" might be mistakenly supposed to have authority and wealth in their own right until shown by the manifestation of the "heir" to be "weak and beggarly." This semi-personal sense is more common to Jewish and patristic writings than that of "rudiments of learning," or "stars," *i.e.*, cosmic beings of the constella-

4. ments of the world: but when <sup>°</sup>the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, <sup>°</sup>born of a woman, <sup>°</sup>born  
 5. under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of  
 6. sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, <sup>°</sup>Abba, Father.

tions, the latter sense being nearer to the present. Here, as in Col. 2 : 8, 20 (*cf.* the adjoining ver. 10, 15, 18), Paul means "the principalities and powers, the world-rulers of this darkness" (Eph. 6 : 12; 1 Cor. 2 : 8).

4. In this semi-mythologic context it is obvious that Paul is not thinking of a sending from Nazareth, but from the height of heaven (*cf.* Rom. 10 : 6-8; Eph. 4 : 8-10). We must interpret accordingly the self-impoverishment of the Son in 2 Cor. 8 : 9, and the "obedience" of Phil. 2 : 6-9. It is a cosmic transaction in a preëxistent state. It should be needless to say that Paul does not derive this conception of the career of Jesus from the story of Peter, but from current apocalyptic ideas of the world-redeemer, interpreted in the light of his own "visions and revelations of the Lord." Nevertheless he takes pains to emphasize the purely human conditions under which "the Son" appeared (*cf.* Heb. 2 : 17; 4 : 15); otherwise his cosmic Christology could not have been adjusted to the simple recollection of the Galilean apostles. **The fulness of the time.** The cosmic economy of the Creator is conceived under the images of the redemption of Israel from Egypt as in Eph. 1 : 3-14. The release of the "sons" cannot occur until the period set for the dominion of the hostile powers, as in Gen. 15 : 16. **Born of a woman.** The "weaker vessel." The expression is used similarly of human frailty in Job 14 : 1; Mt. 11 : 11, and elsewhere. This context, where the effort is to show the completeness of Christ's assumption of our common humanity with all its weaknesses, should be the last to set over against Rom. 1 : 3, as if it denied the human fatherhood. **Born under the law.** The reason to Paul's mind why the world-redeemer was "made a minister of the circumcision" (Rom. 15 : 8) was that among the circumcision the opposition between the "law of sin in our members" and the "law of the mind" had reached its acutest stage. As friend and Redeemer of "sinners" he must go where the sense of sin was most acute.

6. The reasoning is from the phenomena of "tongues," the most conspicuous manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. 14 : 2-19, 22). Among the "strange" (*i.e.* foreign) words most frequently heard in these ecstatic utterances (1 Cor. 14 : 21) was the Aramaic

7. So that thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son;  
°and if a son, then an heir through God.
8. Howbeit °at that time, °not knowing God, ye were °in
9. bondage to them which by nature are no gods: but  
now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be  
known of God, how turn ye back again to the °weak

---

**Abba** (*i.e.*, Father), which the evangelist Mark retains in the original as being characteristic of Jesus (Mk. 14 : 36). The fuller parallel to our present passage, Rom. 8 : 23, 26, 27, compares these "inarticulate groanings" of the Spirit to the voiceless cry of the fettered creation. It is "the Spirit of Adoption" which intercedes with God for us, in sounds of which men catch only here and there the broken "cry," Abba, Abba.

7. Return to 3 : 2. The essence of the "gift of the Spirit" is *adoption*. Herein Paul is true to the noblest teachings of Pharisaism; and also profoundly, vitally true to the most essential teaching of Jesus, seeing more clearly than the Galilean apostles themselves. **And if a son, then an heir.** Herein Paul makes the polemic inference required in the interest of his special gospel of Gentile equality. To be a world-religion Christianity must take the step with him.

**PRACTICAL INFERENCE:** (1) *Galatian observance of the Mosaic calendar is the beginning of a return to bondage, undoing the work of redemption*, 4 : 8-11.

8. **At that time.** When the spirit came; cf. 3 : 2. **Not knowing God.** The heathen are supposed to be ignorant of the true God (cf. Acts 17 : 23; 1 Thess. 1 : 9). The Galatians had evidently been converted from heathenism, though the work doubtless began from Jewish synagogues (Acts 13 : 14, 43; 14 : 1, 4). **In bondage to . . . no gods.** See on ver. 3, and cf. Heb. 2 : 15.

9. Paul delights in the turning of the phrase "knowing God" — somewhat redolent of Jewish self-complacency, Rom. 2 : 17-20 — into its converse: The real revelation is not of the Father, but of the Son, God's acknowledgment of "them that are his" (2 Tim. 2 : 19). In 1 Cor. 8 : 2-3 it thus reappears. The same combination is effected in a saying of Jesus, coincidentally reported in Mt. 11 : 27 and Lk. 10 : 22. Against the claim of the scribes to define the limits of sonship (Mt. 23 : 13) Jesus opposes that of the Father, who has a prior right to acknowledge his own; against their claim to have the authoritative "knowledge of God" he advances that of "the son" (generic as in Jn. 8 : 35), the insight of those who are like-minded (Mt. 5 : 8, 45). The *combination* of the two sayings is perhaps due to Pauline influence. **Weak and beggarly.** As only "clothed with

and beggarly <sup>1</sup> rudiments, whereunto ye desire to be in  
10. bondage over again? Ye observe <sup>o</sup>days, and months,

<sup>1</sup> Or, *elements*

a little brief authority." See on ver. 3, and note Paul's disdain of the Phrygian tendency to a "worship of angels" (Col. 2 : 8-23). The scientist's formula for the exorcism of the "spirits" that obsess credulous humanity is the "reign of law"; the Christian's is the reign of the Son of God. Paul is thus emancipated from the debasing fear of these "gods many and lords many" *before* science comes to prove their non-existence.

**10. Days, and months, and seasons, and years.** We must distinguish between a nobler and a baser type of Judaism in Paul's day. There was (1) the Pharisaism represented by Paul himself, represented also by the Palestinian synagogue, as we see it, purified from the superstitions of Paul's time by the great reaction of the second century A.D. There was also (2) what Harnack has called the "syncretistic" Judaism popularly known throughout the Roman Empire as a debasing superstition of "astrologers, haruspices and quacksalvers." Acts 19 : 13 knows of Ephesus and Asia as particularly infested with this type in the form of "strolling Jews, exorcists." It knows elsewhere (13 : 6-8) of the hold they obtain by their "magic" in the palaces of the great. Many contemporary evidences survive in the form of amulets and "magic papyri" or lead rolls, of this debased and mongrel type of Judaism which made merchandise of the reputation of Moses. Paul himself in this same region of Phrygia has occasion later to stem the tide of a similar mongrel Jewish angelolatry (Col. 2 : 8-20). We need not then be surprised to find a Christian writer of *ca.* 140 A.D. declaring that "the Jews, although they think that they alone know God, do not know him, but worship angels and archangels, the month and the moon." Paul certainly condemns here implicitly that observance of sabbaths which in Col. 2 : 16 he condemns explicitly. And this was in fact to the Gentile observer the most conspicuous and distinctive feature of the Mosaic system. In contemporary Jewish writings also the observance of the feasts at exactly the legal time is made a matter of prime importance just because of the connection of this calendar with the celestial luminaries, conceived as directly under the charge of "angels." For the same reason Paul regards it as the most conspicuous evidence of the Galatians' disposition to return into the bondage of the elements of the world. This particular feature of the law is that which especially marks it as "given through angels" (3 : 19). What can be tolerated as the scrupulousness of a "weak" conscience in a born Jew (Rom. 14 : 5-6), Paul has no patience with in imitation

11. and seasons, and years. I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed <sup>o</sup>labour upon you in vain.

12. I beseech you, brethren, <sup>o</sup>be as I *am*, for I *am* as ye <sup>13. are.</sup> <sup>o</sup>Ye did me no wrong: but ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto

Mosaists. In the second century “sabbattizing” was still more severely denounced.

11. **Labour in vain.** Cf. 2 : 2. The two passages are reciprocally illuminative.

(2) *Paul entreats the Galatians by the contrast of their present coldness with the zeal and love of former days*, 4 : 12-20.

12. **Be** (Gr. “become”) **as I.** The true rendering of the first half of ver. 12 compels the rendering “I became” in the second. Paul is far from acknowledging that he *is* as the Galatians *are*. He *became* as they *were* when he preached to them at the first, according to his principle described in 1 Cor. 9 : 19-22, and the retrospect in 2 : 16. Abandoning his Pharisaic superiority, he had put himself on the level of “sinners of the Gentiles.” Now he has a right to expect that they shall not seek a superiority which he had relinquished on their account.

13. Our ignorance of the circumstances makes the allusions obscure. It is implied that Paul had made two visits prior to the time of writing, the former either to recover health, or to avoid overtaxing a weakened frame; in either case not conditions to suggest long journeys over the sparsely settled plateau of Galatia proper. See Introduction, p. 21.

**Ye did** (or “have done”) **me no wrong.** In imposing the obligation to become also a “sinner”? Cf. 2 : 17. Or perhaps, “You never did me a wrong. Why then should I be your enemy?” This sense is preferable to “You have never disobeyed me.”

14. Paul’s illness was a temptation to strangers to treat him with loathing, or contempt. Its nature has been variously conjectured as malarial fever, ophthalmia, and epilepsy. The last is suggested by the fuller description of symptoms in 2 Cor. 12 : 7, and especially by the expression “spat out” (see Gr.) in this verse. Epilepsy was commonly regarded as of demonic origin (Mk. 9 : 14-29) and communicable. Spitting was a practice specially employed in such cases, not only as an expression of loathing, but as a prophylactic. If this be really the nature of Paul’s “stake in the flesh” which came to “buffet” him, lest he should be exalted overmuch by the “visions and revelations” he enjoyed, we must attribute the latter not to the

14. you the <sup>1</sup> first time: and that which was a temptation to you in my flesh ye despised not, nor <sup>2</sup> rejected; but ye received me as an angel of God, *even* as Christ Jesus.

15. Where then is that gratulation <sup>3</sup> of yourselves? for I bear you witness, that, if possible, ye would have

16. <sup>4</sup>plucked out your eyes and given them to me. So then am I become <sup>5</sup>your enemy, because I <sup>6</sup>tell you the

17. truth? <sup>7</sup>They zealously seek you in no good way; nay, they desire to shut you out, that ye may seek them.

18. But it is good to be zealously sought in a good matter <sup>8</sup>at all times, and not only when I am present with

<sup>1</sup> Gr. *former*.   <sup>2</sup> Gr. *spat out*.   <sup>3</sup> Or, *of yours*   <sup>4</sup> Or, *deal truly with you*.

catalepsy itself, during which the victim is wholly unconscious, but to the period of extreme exaltation which sometimes precedes the attack. The Galatians, in spite of this "temptation," received Paul not as possessed of an evil spirit, but as an angel of God, as an incarnation of the spirit of Jesus. In Acts 14 : 11 we have an instance of the extraordinary devotion paid to the missionaries in this region. The fickleness of the mob's behavior immediately after (14 : 19) is surely quite equal to anything attributable to "Celtic blood."

15. **Plucked out your eyes.** Affection of the sight is said sometimes to accompany epilepsy. But the figure need not necessarily have been suggested by any special symptom.

16. **Your enemy.** The epithet is probably quoted. It is the same employed of the sower of tares in Mt. 13 : 28 and in the early anti-Pauline literature specifically of Paul himself. The sentence need not be a question, but an affirmation or exclamation: "So that now, by telling you the truth I am become your "enemy"!"

17. **They zealously seek.** Gr. "are zealous over." Again the language is probably borrowed. The Judaizers explain their own activity by zeal for the Galatians' welfare; for Paul in offering them a gospel without the yoke of the law has been really their "enemy" in the guise of a friend who makes the requirements of salvation easy. Paul replies that this kind of "zeal" is far from disinterested. The Judaizers are really interested in nothing but the safeguarding of their own prerogative as "heirs." They are afraid of losing their grasp on "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," possession of which insures their being paid zealous court to.

18. **At all times, and not only when I am present.** The contrast

19. you. °My little children, of whom I am again in travail  
 20. °until Christ be formed in you, yea, °I could wish to  
     be present with you now, and to change my voice; for  
     °I am perplexed about you.  
 21. Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, °do ye  
 22. not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had  
     two sons, one by the handmaid, and one by the free-

shows that Paul is thinking of the zealous court first mentioned, that paid by the Galatians to him. The other *was* paid in his absence. The obscurity of the sense has led some scribes to insert "for you." The sense really requires "for me" (see var.).

19. **My little children.** The endearing epithet is coined to meet the situation Paul describes by comparison with the birth-pangs of a mother. *Their* first zeal may have turned to indifference or even hatred. *His* is renewed in a second agony.

20. **Until Christ be formed in you.** Not individually but in the aggregate. The Church as in 1 Cor. 12:12; Eph. 4:16 becomes an organism incarnating the Spirit of Christ. Paul's sufferings are the birth-pangs through which the man-child is brought into the world, "the Christ that is to be."

21. **I could wish.** The fact that Paul finds it needless to explain what prevents his coming, is taken by Zahn as evidence that he is more remote from Galatia than Antioch or Ephesus. See Introduction, p. 33. **I am perplexed.** At a loss what to do. Shall he "change his voice" (*i.e.* "tone") from rebuke to entreaty? The next paragraph renews the appeal to scriptural authority.

(3) *A warning against submission to the yoke. In allegory the law itself prefigures the contrast between the fleshly heir of Abraham, a bond-slave, and the spiritual, born of a freewoman, 4: 21-30.*

21. **Do ye not hear the law?** In Paul's letters the practice of Gentile churches in using the Old Testament in public worship is clearly attested, with a striking example in the present instance of the rabbinic allegorical interpretation in vogue.

22. Gen. 16 and 21:1-21 afford to Paul a "scriptural" confirmation of his doctrine (3:8, 16, 22) of a spiritual "seed of Abraham" as real "heir of the world." In two respects the two sons born to Abraham are differentiated. The elder, Ishmael, was (*a*) son of a slave-woman, (*b*) born "after the flesh," *i.e.*, in the ordinary course of nature. The younger, Isaac, was born (*a*) of a freewoman, (*b*) against the course of nature, by the miraculous operation of a "word of promise."

23. woman. Howbeit the *son* by the handmaid is born after the flesh; but the *son* by the freewoman is <sup>°</sup>born

24. through promise. Which things <sup>°</sup>contain an allegory: for these *women* <sup>°</sup>are two covenants; one from mount Sinai, bearing children unto bondage, which is Hagar.

25. <sup>°</sup>1 Now this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to the Jerusalem that now is: <sup>°</sup>for she is in

<sup>1</sup> Many ancient authorities read *For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia.*

23. **Born through** (*i.e.*, “by the agency of”) **promise.** The point is more fully elaborated in Rom. 4: 19-21 and 9: 9. The latter passage conveys the full Semitic sense, of the word itself operating as the agency by means of which the result is attained. Isaac for this reason was called in Jewish writings the “God-begotten,” and in Christian allegorization becomes a type of Christ. Thus in its earliest manifestation the doctrine of the supernatural birth applies to Christians generally, and is identical with that of the “sowing of the word” in 1 Pt. 1: 23-25; Jas. 1: 18; Jn. 1: 11-13. The application to Jesus specifically is secondary.

24. **Contain an allegory.** The controversy as to whether we should understand “are spoken allegorically,” or “should (or may) be understood allegorically,” cannot be decided on merely philological grounds. There is the less reason for the attempt in that to Paul it would have made no difference. Anything that *could* be derived from scripture was authoritative for his time, whether so intended by the author, or not. See notes on 3: 16 and 4: 30. **Are two covenants.** As in ver. 25-26 they are two cities. The appropriateness of making Hagar correspond to the covenant of law is made to appear in several ways, first of all from Hagar’s birthplace near the scene of the giving of the law, second from her condition as a slave.

25. **For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia.** (Better reading; see var.) The clause has many variants in the MSS., and since the sense seems much clearer without it, was regarded even by Lightfoot as very probably a gloss introduced as a geographical note, to explain ver. 24. If retained as authentic the clause should at least be enclosed in (), for not its subject, but that of the preceding clause, is the subject of the following verb “answereth to.” The tribe of the Hagarenes has indeed its habitat “in Arabia,” but there is no evidence extant that the mountain of the law known in the Old Testament variously as “Horeb” and “Sinai” was ever called by this tribal name.

**For she is in bondage.** A reference at once to the political condi-

26. bondage with her children. But <sup>o</sup>the Jerusalem that is  
27. above is free, which is our mother. For it is written,

Is. 54 : 1

Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not;  
Break forth and cry, thou that travailest not:  
For more are the children of the desolate than of  
her which hath the husband.

---

tion of Jerusalem under the yoke of Rome, and the religious condition of "her children" under the yoke of the law. From covenants the metaphor is changed to cities, by force of the constant Semitic figure of a city as "mother" of its inhabitants.

26. **The Jerusalem that is above.** The conception of the New Jerusalem belongs already to messianic prophecy, or rather to the conventions of contemporary apocalypse. In Ps. 87 : 6 God is represented as counting, as he makes up the list of the redeemed, that "this one and that one was born" in Zion. In New Testament times the transformation of prophetic hopes from national into cosmic forms, effected by the apocalyptic school, had changed the ancient hope of a new (*i.e.* rebuilt) Jerusalem into that of a celestial city, already prepared in the treasuries of heaven (Heb. 11 : 16; 12 : 22), ready to be "let down out of heaven from God" (Rev. 21 : 10) in the "age to come." In an age which could not conceive of a united humanity save under the historic forms of its own city-empires of Babylon and Rome, the "city of the Great King" (Mt. 5 : 35) must of course be Jerusalem, but for a heavenly king only a heavenly city was admissible. In Rev. 21 : 9-22 : 5 the Christian apocalypticist endeavors to complete the picture of this miraculous capital of the kingdom of God along the lines first traced by Ezekiel. These conceptions are presupposed in substance in Paul's references to our citizenship in heaven in Phil. 3 : 20 and here, as well as in the saying of Jesus which perhaps suggests them and is itself suggested by Ps. 87, "Rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Lk. 10 : 20). Note especially that the New Testament conception is not of a city in heaven to which believers go at death; but a city which comes *from* heaven to them in the Day of Christ's appearing, and remains thereafter firm-fixed on the mountains of Judah, the central metropolis of the earth (Rev. 21 : 24-26).

27. In "Isaiah's" contrast of the more populous restored Jerusalem with the city which had been destroyed, under the figure of a wife once barren and deserted but now restored to her husband and fruitful of children, Paul finds scriptural support for his figure of Hagar and Sarah. As compared with the Jewish dispersion the

28. Now <sup>1</sup> we, brethren, as Isaac was, are <sup>o</sup>children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh <sup>o</sup>persecuted him *that was born* after the Spirit, even so 30. it is now. Howbeit what saith the scripture? Cast out the handmaid and her son: for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the free woman.

Gen. 21:10,  
12

<sup>1</sup> Many ancient authorities read *ye*.

“Israel of God” was at this time a pitiful handful, but Paul already foresaw the coming reversal of conditions.

28. **Children of promise.** See note on ver. 23 and *cf.* Rom. 4: 19-21; 9: 7-9; Jn. 1: 11-13. The “spiritual seed” are the progeny of a “new birth” effected by “the word of good tidings preached unto you” (1 Pt. 1: 25), and thus correspond to Isaac, who was born “after the Spirit” through the operation of a “word of promise.”

29. **Persecuted.** Persecution of Christians by Jews of the Dispersion (not by the Roman power, which until the great tragedy at Rome in 64 A.D. invariably appears as their protector against Jewish hatred) is repeatedly referred to by Paul (6: 12 and 1 Thes. 2: 14-16), specifically in case of the Galatians themselves (see on 3: 4). The “persecution” of Isaac by Ishmael, however, requires the rabbinic eye to discover in Scripture. Jewish legend interpreted the “playing” or “mocking” of Ishmael which aroused the jealousy of Sarah (Gen. 21: 9, one of the many plays upon the name “Isaac,” as derived from the Hebrew stem meaning to “laugh,” “play,” “sport”) as at Isaac’s expense; it even asserted that Ishmael “shot arrows at Isaac.”

30. Paul is certainly a master in the rabbinic art of “scriptural” polemic. Out of the ancient legend by which the Jews exalted Israel the admittedly younger stock at the expense of Ishmael, — *i.e.*, the nomadic Arabians, — explaining that these were sons of a slave-mother from Egypt (*i.e.*, derived from the Hagarenes, a tribe under Egyptian domination), their own ancestor on the contrary being of free birth in the land, whence the divine appointment of “the inheritance” (*i.e.* Canaan), Paul fashions a weapon against themselves. It is they now who are claiming “the inheritance” by virtue of mere descent, and thus putting themselves in the place of those whom the Scripture declares “shall not inherit” but must be “cast out.” A similar application of the same two passages (Gen. 21: 10, 12 and Is. 54: 1) had been previously made by Philo; but with the more highly developed allegory characteristic of Alexandrianism Sarah’s children, the fruit of divine wisdom, displace those of Hagar, derived from mere earthly knowledge.

31. Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of <sup>o</sup>a hand-  
 5. maid, but of the freewoman.<sup>1</sup> <sup>o</sup><sup>2</sup>With freedom did  
 Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not  
 entangled again in a yoke of bondage.  
 2. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that, if ye receive cir-  
 3. cumcision, Christ will profit you nothing. Yea, I

<sup>1</sup> Some ancient authorities read *Stand fast (therefore) in that liberty wherewith . . . and be not.* <sup>2</sup> Or, *For freedom*

---

(4) CONCLUDING APPEAL. *Paul entreats the Galatians to have done with the Judaizers.* 4 : 31-5 : 12.

(a) *Vigilance the price of Christian liberty*, 4 : 31-5 : 1.

The two verses which separate the exposition of Scripture from its application are transitional. Interpreters naturally differ as to paragraphing. The text also varies, admitting as at least equally probable the rendering: "But we, brethren, are not children of a slave, but of the freewoman by virtue of the freedom wherewith Christ set us free. Stand fast."

4 : 31. **A handmaid.** Sense and language alike require the rendering "slave-woman."

5 : 1. **With freedom.** The alternative rendering "for freedom" is preferable, or we may connect the clause with the preceding verse, rendering, "Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a bond-woman, but of the freewoman through the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." (See var.) The concluding paragraph of the section will then begin, "Stand fast, then, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage." The general principle here laid down is developed later in the practical division of the Epistle (5 : 13-6 : 10). The apostle in including the conduct essential to the welfare of the brotherhood makes it his point of departure to show what is involved in Christian "freedom." So the gift of the Spirit enunciated in 3 : 1-5 is elaborated as to its content in 4 : 1-7. Previous to this definition of "freedom" comes the special appeal against the Judaizers, ver. 2-12.

(b) *Circumcision is not a mere counsel of perfection, wherewith the supposed deficiencies of faith may be supplemented. Its assumption under present conditions is destructive of the work of faith*, 5 : 2-6.

2. Paul's own principle of the complete indifference of the Mosaic ritual prescriptions (ver. 6; 6 : 15) was liable to be invoked against him, as his practice under it already had been (ver. 11). If indifferent, circumcision could do no harm, and might better be adopted "for safety." Against such reasoning Paul now insists again (see on 2 :

testify <sup>o</sup>again to every man that receiveth circumcision,

4. that he is a debtor <sup>o</sup>to do the whole law. Ye are  
<sup>1</sup> severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the

5. law; ye are fallen away from grace. For we through  
 the Spirit by faith wait for <sup>o</sup>the hope of righteousness.

6. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any-

---

<sup>1</sup> Gr. *brought to nought*.

---

15-21) on the mutual exclusiveness of justification by the law and by grace. Under other circumstances (see on ver. 11) circumcision might be indifferent. Received as a supplement to faith, it is a testimony of distrust, the negation of faith, which is the fundamental condition of profit from Christ.

3. **Again.** See 3:10-12 and notes. It is vital to Paul's argument to show that the compromising attitude of the Judaizers, represented in Mt. 19:17-21; Acts 13:39; Jas. 2:21-22, is untenable. One cannot rely for "justification" partly on grace and partly on merit; for the two are mutually exclusive. **To do the whole law.** The Judaizers themselves did not insist upon all the Mosaic requirements (6:13), and showed here the weakness of their position. In fact even the Jewish propaganda in the Dispersion showed startling discrepancies in this respect. Jas. 2:10-11 endeavors in another way to check the inconsistency.

4. To realize the exceptional stress laid by Paul upon the complete abandonment of all reliance upon merit we must recall his personal religious experience (Phil. 3:3-10; Rom. 7:9-11). To bring the general mass of believers in Christ to a similar experience was a task which even a Paul found impossible.

5. **The hope of righteousness.** Abstract for concrete, as in Col. 1:5; Tit. 2:13; Heb. 6:18. Grammatically the clause might mean "the hope of being justified" (in the judgment). In the light of the developed parallel, Rom. 8:19-25, it is certain that Paul means the hope given to the righteous (Rom. 8:24; Col. 1:5; Heb. 6:18). This hope, including all the blessings of the messianic kingdom, is awaited on both sides. The Judaizers rest their expectations on fleshly descent, and obedience to the law; Paul and those like-minded on the "earnest" of the Spirit of adoption (Eph. 1:14) and the faith which had been the beginning of their redemption; *cf.* 2:20.

6. The indifference of circumcision is reasserted as a principle, but only by virtue of the fact that "faith working through love" has become the master motive. Hence resort to it to supplement the possible insufficiency of grace is not indifferent, because, as already

thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith<sup>°</sup> working through love.

7. Ye were running well; <sup>2</sup> who did hinder you that  
 8. ye should not obey the truth? <sup>°</sup>This persuasion *came*  
 9. not of him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth  
 10. the whole lump. I have confidence to you-ward in  
     the Lord, that ye will be none <sup>°</sup>otherwise minded:  
 11. but <sup>°</sup>he that troubleth you shall bear his judgement,  
 12. whosoever he be. But I, brethren, <sup>°</sup>if I still preach  
     circumcision, why am I still persecuted? then hath

<sup>1</sup> Or, wrought      <sup>2</sup> A few ancient authorities read *who did hinder you? Be persuaded by no one against the persuasion of the truth.*

---

shown, the negation of faith. He who takes this course has no faith; he is not “in Christ Jesus.” **Working** (not “wrought,” alternative rendering) **through love.** Paul is approaching the practical section, in which the objection will be met that to remove the motive of legal obligation will result in moral laxity. Faith also *results* in works, and therefore may even as a rule be judged by them (6 : 7, 1 Cor. 3 : 13; 2 Cor. 5 : 10), but it does not *depend* on them.

(c) *The agitators and their false charge, 5 : 7-12.*

7. The sense and grammar are much improved by following the variant reading, which has good though not abundant manuscript support.

8. **This persuasion.** That which is “against the truth.”

9. A proverbial saying employed similarly in 1 Cor. 5 : 6. The suggestion is that the reaction can only be explained by outside interference.

10. **Otherwise minded.** *I.e.*, than myself; *cf.* Phil. 3 : 15. **He that troubleth.** A singular here, against a plural in 1 : 7. Paul’s threat is directed against even the most influential of the disturbers, with manifest allusion to “those of repute” in Jerusalem (2 : 2, 6, 9).

11. **If I still preach circumcision.** A defence against the charge of inconsistency. The Judaizers allege that Paul himself, when he finds it politic, still recommends circumcision. This charge has a certain support in the incident of the circumcision of Timothy, a Galatian of Lystra, Greek on the father’s side, very shortly before the outbreak of the Judaizing opposition, by Paul himself, expressly for the purpose of conciliating “the Jews that were in those parts” (Acts 16 : 3). Previous to the Judaizing reaction, Paul may very

12. the <sup>o</sup>stumblingblock of the cross been done away. I would that they which unsettle you would even <sup>o</sup><sup>1</sup>cut themselves off.

<sup>1</sup> Or, *mutilate themselves*

well have taken the step described in Acts 16: 1-3. The use of the word "still" in his reply to the charge seems to indicate just this distinction in time. On the general relation of Acts to Galatians, and the real course of events after the first appearance of the "false brethren," see Introduction, p. 30 ff., and Appended Note B. **Stumbling-block of the cross.** Cf. 6: 12. The two passages furnish a clear intimation that to Paul at least, and to Jews like-minded, Christianity could have been tolerated but for its undermining of the authority of *the Law*. But for the interpretation of the cross as assuring a "righteousness not through the law" (2: 21; cf. Rom. 1: 17) there would have been no persecution by the Synagogue. This was the unpardonable "offence of the cross," 1 Cor. 1: 23. Lightfoot paraphrases: "So I have adopted their mode of justification; I am silent about the Cross of Christ! no one takes offence at my preaching now; all goes on pleasantly enough!"

12. **Cut themselves off**; or, "mutilate themselves." In spite of what jars upon the sensibilities of the modern reader as savoring of coarseness, we can only say, with Lightfoot, the alternative rendering "seems alone tenable." In fact since circumcision is the rite in question, and Paul has just been placing Mosaic ritual ordinances on a level with those of the "world-rulers" or "Elements," it is at least conceivable that he has in mind the self-castration of the Phrygian priests of Cybele, as parallel to circumcision. If the rite is to be conceived as a means of attaining merit with God, then the heathen form of the rite is even preferable, as more thoroughgoing. If such be Paul's meaning, his plain language has at least the merit of dissipating all further attempts to represent him as recommending circumcision as a work of merit. The alternative interpretation, "Would that they would sever their connection with the brotherhood," finds meagre point of attachment in the context.



III. PRACTICAL EXHORTATION. PAUL SHOWS THAT THE PRINCIPLE OF FREEDOM DOES NOT LEAD TO LICENSE, BEING BASED UPON THE DOMINATION OF THE SPIRIT OF LOVE, WHICH IMPELS TO PURITY AND KINDNESS.

IN THE INDIVIDUAL THIS SPIRIT GIVES CONTROL OVER THE IMPULSES OF THE FLESH. IN THE BROTHERHOOD IT CHECKS ALL STRIFE, AND IMPELS STRONG AND WEAK TO RECIPROCAL SERVICE. IN A SPECIAL FAREWELL, WRITTEN WITH HIS OWN HAND, PAUL EPITOMIZES THE TEACHING OF HIS LETTER, 5 : 13-6 : 18.

1. *The moral effect of Christian freedom is shown to be the curbing of the flesh, and the peaceful progress of the brotherhood in mutual service, 5 : 13-6 : 10* 5 : 13

13. For ye, brethren, were called for freedom; only use not your freedom for <sup>°</sup>an occasion to the flesh, but

---

GENERAL PROPOSITION: *Christian freedom leads not to indulgence of the flesh, but to mutual service, and thus meets the ideal of the law, 5:13-15.*

13. A return to the point established in 4 : 1-5 : 12, made in order to discriminate the true from the false inference. The false inference drawn by Paul's detractors (see on 2 : 17 and *cf.* the "slander," Rom. 3 : 8) is that without the obligation of law there will be no restraint to the passions. **An occasion** (Gr. a sally-port, place from which to launch an attack). The man who has been accustomed to refrain from evil only through fear of penalty thinks thus of freedom. He forgets that there is no freedom save to those in whose life the Spirit has become dominant (2 : 20). And this Spirit is that of him who "took upon him the form of a servant and became obedient unto the death of the cross" (Phil. 2 : 5-11).

Lev. 19 : 18

14. through love be servants one to another. For <sup>o</sup>the whole law is fulfilled in one word, *even* in this; Thou

15. shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.

16. <sup>o</sup>But I say, <sup>o</sup>Walk by the Spirit, and ye <sup>o</sup>shall not fulfil

14. Preëminently in the practical exhortations which form the closing division of every letter of Paul to his churches, he approximates to the sayings of Jesus reported in the Gospels.

The whole law is fulfilled, *i.e.*, in the observance of one maxim, not 'is summarized.' Cf. ver. 21; 6 : 2. The "new commandment" of Christ is not here expressly attributed to him as in Mt. 22 : 38, though not in the parallels (Mk. 12 : 29 = Lk. 10 : 27). The originality of the ethics of Jesus lies not in his epitome of the spirit of the Law, however noble; for Hillel and others had similarly expressed it. It lies in the substitution of inward likeness to the Father for obedience to prescription as the note of sonship (with Mt. 5 : 43-48 = Lk. 6 : 27-36; cf. Eph. 4 : 31-5 : 2). Paul and Mark (Phil. 2 : 5-11; cf. Mk. 10 : 43-45) express this by describing "the mind which was in Christ Jesus"; "Matthew" and "Luke" by formulating his teaching into a "new law." In Rom. 13 : 8-10 Paul repeats the principle 'Love fulfils the law' with more explicit application.

15. Equally characteristic of Paul as of "John" is the exhortation, "Little children, love one another." Division and strife, whether at Corinth (1 Cor. 1 : 10-13), in Asia (Eph. 4 : 1-3; Col. 2 : 2; 3 : 12-15), at Philippi (Phil. 2 : 1-4), and even where Paul's face was not known (Rom. 14 : 1-15 : 7), is the danger that supremely moves his soul for the churches. To meet it he has always the same remedy, "the mind of Christ," a forbearing, forgiving, ministering spirit of love, which "never faileth" (cf. 1 Cor. cc. 12-14). The presence of the opposite spirit among the Galatians is a symptom of their backward movement, and portends disaster. This phase of the subject is resumed in 5 : 25-6 : 6.

(1) *The mind of the Spirit leads of itself to the curbing of the flesh,*  
5 : 16-24.

16. **But I say.** Better, "What I mean is"; see on 3 : 17 and 4 : 1. **Walk by the Spirit.** The doctrine of the Spirit is the foundation of the Church, as historically the coming of the Spirit was its origin. This we have already seen (see on 3 : 2). But the personal religious experience of Paul gave to his particular application of the doctrine a new and mystical trend, which is not Jewish but Hellenistic, and ultimately Stoic. To the ordinary Christian, such as those

17. the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the 18. things that ye would. But if ye are led by the Spirit,

addressed in 1 Cor. cc. 12-14, or as the author of Acts, the "gifts of the Spirit" are preëminently the phenomena of "tongues," "miracles," "healings," such as a Simon Magus may seek the power of conveying for money (Acts 8 : 14-19); though the impulse to extraordinary acts of self-sacrifice is also included (Acts 2 : 44; 4 : 33-35; 1 Cor. 13 : 3). To Paul the gift of the Spirit is the infusion from God of a portion of his own nature, identical in substance with that of Christ and with the latent power in all men which he designates in Rom. 7 : 22, 23 "the inward man" or the "mind." The reënforcement of the "mind" by this infusion from God of the "mind of Christ" makes men God's sons by adoption, as being henceforth predominantly controlled by his Spirit; for the battle between flesh (controlled since Adam's transgression by "sin") and spirit, which previously had been constantly and inevitably a losing fight, becomes thereafter with equal certainty victorious. All mere outward "manifestations of the Spirit," such as "tongues," "miracles," "prophecies," are necessarily temporary and subordinate to the ethical, since sonship is seen rather in likeness to God's goodness than to his power, and supremely in "love," which was the key-note in the character of Jesus. The mystery of the correlation of the individual's own will and personality with the infused Spirit Paul does not attempt to solve. The individual ego remains and seeks to "work out his own salvation," unhindered by the consciousness that even in willing as well as doing "it is God that worketh in us." To "walk in (or by) the Spirit" is therefore a proper form of exhortation even to those fully conscious of the "adoption of sons"; cf. Rom. 8 : 12-14; Phil. 2 : 12-13; 1 Cor. 13. The Pauline mysticism is founded on an antithesis of flesh and spirit alien to earlier Hebrew thought. To understand it requires both an appreciation of Stoic influence in the later literature, and sympathetic remembrance of Paul's special religious experience (Phil. 3 : 5-7; Rom. 7 : 9-25).

**Shall not fulfil.** Better "will surely not." The word is not an imperative but a strengthened form of the future.

17. Cf. Rom. 7 : 18-25, where the warfare, as including also the period before the gift of the Spirit, is between the "mind" and the flesh.

18. Cf. Rom. 8 : 14, 15; Jn. 15 : 15. Sonship and servitude are mutually exclusive terms. The proof was given in 4 : 1-7.

19. ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are *these*, <sup>°</sup>fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, <sup>°</sup>sorcery, <sup>°</sup>enmities, strife, 20. jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, <sup>1</sup> heresies, envyings, <sup>°</sup>drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I <sup>2</sup> forewarn you, even as <sup>°</sup>I did <sup>2</sup> forewarn you, that they which practise such things shall not 21. 22. <sup>°</sup>inherit the kingdom of God. But <sup>°</sup>the fruit of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *parties*<sup>2</sup> Or, *tell you plainly*

---

19. The impulses of “flesh” under control of “sin” fall into three classes in accordance with actual manifestations in the environment of the Pauline churches: (a) **Fornication . . . idolatry**. The grouping is characteristic of the times, immorality being chiefly practised in connection with idol worship; *cf.* the “pollutions of idols” in Acts 15 : 20, 29; 1 Thess. 4 : 4, 5; 1 Cor. 10 : 1-22; Rom. 1 : 24-27; Eph. 5 : 3-5; Col. 3 : 5. **Sorcery** is kindred as a “holding converse with demons” (1 Cor. 10 : 14-22; Acts 19 : 19; Rev. 21 : 8; 22 : 15).

20. **Enmities . . . heresies, envyings**. A single group (b) all springing from the divisive spirit referred to in ver. 15. “Heresy” in New Testament use has still its etymological sense of “factiousness,” quite independent of the truth or falsity of the doctrine contended for.

21. **Drunkenness, revellings**. We should expect these to be mentioned in connection with the “pollutions of idols,” ver. 19; for the reference is to the scandal referred to in Eph. 5 : 11, 12, the carousings of orgiastic religious clubs, whose banquets were a prominent feature of Graeco-Roman social life, and are contrasted with the sobriety and purity of the well-conducted Christian convective in Eph. 5 : 18-20. **I did forewarn you**. Paul is not now making a belated attempt to forestall the evil consequences of a former laxity. When he first proclaimed his gospel of justification apart from works of the law he had been no less strenuous than the Judaizers themselves in rebuking these “pollutions.”

**Inherit the kingdom of God**. It is specially interesting to note how in taking this common ethical ground he falls naturally into the phraseology of the Gospels; *cf.* 1 Cor. 6 : 9, 10; 15 : 50; Mk. 25 : 34.

22. **The fruit** (not “works”) of the **Spirit** is the converse of the preceding, qualities that make for the welfare of the individual and brotherhood alike. **Faithfulness** (Gr. “faith”). Here, as in Mt. 23 : 23; Tit. 2 : 10, ‘fidelity,’ ‘trustworthiness.’ The active and passive senses of the word were both current. **Temperance**. The alter-

23. Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, <sup>o</sup>faithfulness, meekness, <sup>o</sup><sup>1</sup> temperance: <sup>o</sup>against such there is no law. And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof.

25. If we live <sup>o</sup>by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk. Let us not be vainglorious, provoking one another, envying one another.

6. Brethren, even if a man be <sup>o</sup>overtaken in any trespass, <sup>o</sup>ye which are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of meekness; looking to thyself, lest thou also

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *self-control*

---

native rendering should be preferred, since that of the text is sometimes limited in modern use.

23. **Against such.** The law is conceived as essentially prohibitive. There is no restraint upon those whose impulse is in this direction; for who ever heard of the prohibition of such acts?

24. No other impulse remains in the true Christian, because the act of faith was a decisive victory in the mortal conflict of spirit against flesh; *cf.* 2 : 20.

(2) *Dominance of the Spirit will also correct all the divisive tendencies in the brotherhood*, 5 : 25-6 : 6.

(a) *It will prevent friction in the church*, 5 : 25-26.

25. A reiteration of ver. 16 for the purpose of returning to the complementary effect of life "by the Spirit."

**By the Spirit, by the Spirit.** The first dative expresses means, the second manner; *cf.* Rom. 8 : 1-11.

26. Friction has come through lack of the right spirit in the relation between superiors and inferiors in the brotherhood; *cf.* Phil. 2 : 3-4. "Speaking truth" must be "in love," Eph. 4 : 15. A "vainglorious" ruler is himself a "provoker" and instils "envy" in his subordinate.

(b) *The rule for "those who admonish,"* 6 : 1-5.

6 : 1. **Overtaken**, *i.e.*, 'Caught,' 'detected'; not 'overcome by.'

**Ye which are spiritual.** *I.e.*, have the "spiritual gifts," particularly in this case that of "governments." The address is to those "that have the leadership"; *cf.* 1 Cor. 2 : 13, 15; 3 : 1; 12 : 1; 14 : 17. The reciprocal service of "him that is taught" (Gr. "the catechumen")

2. be tempted. Bear ye one another's <sup>o</sup>burdens, and so
3. <sup>o</sup>fulfil <sup>o</sup>the law of Christ. For if a man thinketh himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth
4. himself. But let each man prove <sup>o</sup>his own work, and then shall he have his <sup>o</sup>glorying in regard of himself
5. alone, and not of <sup>1</sup> his neighbour. For each man shall bear his own <sup>2</sup> burden.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gr. *the other.*    <sup>2</sup> Or, *load*

---

is emphasized in ver. 6. In 1 Thess. 5 : 11-15, under the general direction to exhort and edify one another, the order is reversed. "Those that admonish" are charged to perform their office with "long-suffering toward all." The admonition for which they appear responsible covers a wide range. Here "restoration" refers to standing in the brotherhood.

**2. Burdens.** A different Greek word from that used in ver. 5. Here that which bears down; in ver. 5 that which is contributed to. It may very probably be chosen like the term 'law' with special reference to the 'burdens' of the law (Lk. 11 : 46; Rev. 2 : 25) the Galatians are prone to assume. What Paul means by bearing such appears from Rom. 15 : 1-3.

**Fulfil.** The reading found in some MSS. with future indicative instead of imperative is the more probable.

**The law of Christ.** The reference is not to a specific teaching, even the "new commandment" of love as the epitome of the law (see on 5 : 14), but to Jesus' principle of *rulership*, the constitutional principle of his kingdom, Mk. 10 : 42-45; cf. Phil. 2 : 5-11.

3. "Those who admonish" are still addressed. Only the wish to serve, and the sense of dependence on the Spirit for the means of serving, can rightly qualify them. "Vainglory" is not only injurious but senseless.

**4. His own.** Strongly emphasized. Judgment will sometimes be unavoidable for men so placed (Paul is still addressing the leaders). But the faculty should be mainly directed to one's own performance, not another's. One's sense of confidence then will be based (if it finds foundation) on progress over one's own past, not disesteem of others. Cf. Mk. 9 : 50, "Salt for yourselves: for one another peace"; and Mt. 7 : 1-5.

**Glorying** (elsewhere "boasting"). Almost a Pauline technical term for the Pharisaic sense of merit or self-righteousness. Here, ground of confidence before the tribunal of conscience. See on 6 : 14.

5. This keeping to oneself of one's judgment of merit or demerit

6. But let him that is taught in the word <sup>o</sup>communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things.

7. <sup>o</sup>Be not deceived; <sup>o</sup>God is not mocked: for <sup>o</sup>what-  
8. soever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of

is the more imperative because the task or "load" of each has its own peculiar difficulties.

(c) *The rule for him that is taught, 6:6.*

6. Paul now turns to the "catechumen." His part is the ministrations of "carnal things," since the spiritual have not been committed to him. Cf. Rom. 15:27; 1 Cor. 9:11. **Communicate.** The word is used in a somewhat technical sense, as in the admonition "To do good and to *communicate* (i.e., contribute to the needy) forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

(3) *Moral aspect of Paul's gospel.* *In general, so far from shielding self-indulgence or idleness, the principle of freedom leaves the great cosmic law of retribution unimpaired; therefore work, 6:7-10.*

7. The paragraph division should be sharply marked after ver. 6. With ver. 7 Paul turns to his final and general exhortation.

**Be not deceived**, viz., by the statements of "slanderers" that the Pauline teaching removes the incentive of reward for right-doing and conversely.

**God is not mocked**, as would be the case if an evil life might be lived with impunity in anticipation of a death-bed repentance, a discounting of grace. The failure to observe the break between this new paragraph and ver. 6 results in comments such as the following: "Christians do not always reflect that they are trying to mock God when they withhold, of their worldly possessions, what he requires." This reflection is indeed unlikely to have occurred to the Galatians before or after receipt of Paul's letter. It is still more unlikely that the Judaizers were encouraging niggardly giving.

**Whatsoever a man soweth.** A proverbial expression of the universal principle of moral retribution. Paul's doctrine does not presume to deny or set it aside.

8. On the contrary, his doctrine of flesh and spirit already enunciated (see on 5:16 and cf. Rom. c. 8) is the very apotheosis of this principle. It remains in the man's own choice to cultivate the field of "the flesh" already impregnated with the germs of "corruption," or the field of "the spirit," whose essential nature is to give life eternally (Rom. 8:6, 11; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45-46).

9. the Spirit reap eternal life. And let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we  
 10. faint not. So then, <sup>°</sup>as we have opportunity, let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of the faith.

2. *In a postscript appended with his own hand Paul epitomizes the general admonition of his letter, pronouncing a blessing on such as are worthy, and bidding the brethren farewell in Christ, 6:11-18*

11. See with how large letters I <sup>°</sup>1 have written unto you  
 12. with mine own hand. As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they compel you to be circum-

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, *write*

---

9. Beside this operation of the Spirit in our own bodies, as it were by its very intrinsic nature, there is a further reward for service done in behalf of others; *cf.* 1 Cor. 3:10-15. This reward, given at the season God has appointed, should be a further incentive to good works rendered with unflagging zeal. *Cf.* 2 Thess. 3:13. <sup>°</sup>

10. **As we have opportunity.** Better, "since we have a period appointed"; *cf.* Jn. 11:9. The reference seems to be to the "due season" of ver. 9. The variant reading is less probable.

11. As Paul, according to a custom referred to in 2 Thess. 3:17; 1 Cor. 16:21; and Col. 4:18, takes over in his own hand the pen of the amanuensis to whom he has been dictating (Rom. 16:22), he seems to be struck half humorously with the contrast between his own big and laborious letters, and the fair copy of the professional Greek scribe. As is apt to be the case, especially with those more unaccustomed to the pen, he comments on its unpleasing appearance. The "fair show in the flesh" is not his part (ver. 12). He leaves that to the Judaizers, as he leaves the external matter of the handwriting of his letter to the amanuensis. Such seems to be the bearing of the singular allusion. Grammatically it is perhaps possible to render "how large a letter," and some taking this sense suppose Paul to be calling his readers' attention to the length of the epistle he has been obliged to write, though unable (why does not appear) to command the services of a letter writer. But Galatians is not long enough to require very great manual effort for even an unpractised hand. More-

cised; <sup>1</sup>only that they may not be persecuted <sup>1</sup>for the  
 13. cross of Christ. For not even they who <sup>2</sup>receive  
 circumcision do themselves keep <sup>3</sup>the law; but they  
 desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in  
 14. your flesh. But far be it from me <sup>0</sup>to glory, save <sup>0</sup>in  
 the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through <sup>4</sup>which  
<sup>0</sup>the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the

<sup>1</sup>Or, *by reason of*    <sup>2</sup>Some ancient authorities read *have been circumcised.*  
<sup>3</sup>*a law*    <sup>4</sup>Or, *whom*

over on this interpretation all connection with ver. 12 is lost. It seems more probable that in this quaint touch we have indeed a “token” of authenticity not dreamed of by Paul.

**Have written.** Better with alternative rendering, “I write.” Greek idiom in such cases requires the past. The writer places himself at the point of view of the correspondent addressed. **Only that they may not be persecuted.** See on 5:11. It is implied that Christianity would have been tolerated by the Synagogue if the crucifixion had not been interpreted as “changing the customs delivered by Moses.” This lends color to the supposition that the Pharisaic persecution in which Paul himself had been a leader was provoked by anti-legalistic teaching; *cf.* Acts 6:14.

13. See on 3:11; 5:3. Were the proselyting zeal of the Judaizers really due to the disinterested desire to see the law everywhere honored, they would not inconsistently dispense from part of its requirement (*cf.* 5:14; Mt. 23:23). The real motive, according to Paul’s perhaps somewhat intolerant judgment, is selfish. Besides obtaining a cessation of the persecutions suffered because Christianity is understood to be anti-legalistic, they will have the “glory” promised in Dan. 12:3, for the sake of which the Pharisean propagandist was ready to “compass sea and land,” Mt. 23:15. That it is not so much in the sight of men as before the divine Judge, appears from the contrasted “glorying” of Paul. See note following. **To glory.** The “glorying” or “boasting” which Paul deprecates, whether in his own case or the Judaizers (ver. 13), or the self-righteous Jew (Rom. 2:17), or Abraham (Rom. 4:2), is not a sense of merit in the eyes of men so much as in the eye of God. Hence his own “glorying.”

14. **In the cross of Christ;** *i.e.*, it is his plea for justification at the divine tribunal. “Boasting” is thus in Paul’s use almost a synonym for “the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees” in Synoptic use. **The world hath been crucified unto me.** See on 2:20. “Dying unto sin” by faith in the love of God displayed in the cross, and “rising

Ps. 125 : 5; 128 : 6 15. world. For neither is circumcision anything, nor 16. uncircumcision, but a new <sup>1</sup> creature. And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace *be* upon them, and mercy, and upon <sup>2</sup>the Israel of God.

17. From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear branded on my body <sup>3</sup>the marks of Jesus.

<sup>1</sup> Or, *creation*

again" out of its dominion by infusion of the Spirit of adoption alters the believer's attitude to the entire creation (*cf.* Rom. 8 : 10-23). The world is in fact for all practical purposes a "new creation"; old things exist no more, all things become new in "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God (*cf.* Ex. 33 : 17-23; 34 : 5-8) given in the face of Jesus Christ." This manifestation of the Son with its implication of redemption to the cosmos is the work of him "who said (Gen. 1 : 1) Light shall shine out of darkness" (2 Cor. 4 : 6). To the believer thus the cross "crucifies the (old) world," or crucifies him to it.

15. A repetition of the basic principle of 5 : 6, but with the substitution of the cosmic for the ethical aspect of the redemption. The strong statement of ver. 14 is justified by this principle of the cross, since it proves that God cares not for a mere mark in the flesh, but for the utter transformation of the whole man. Several ancient authors declare this "rule" to be quoted from the Jewish writing, *The Apocalypse of Moses* (*ca.* 40 A.D.). Paul makes use of such in 1 Cor. 2 : 9 and elsewhere, particularly the *Apocalypse or Assumption of Moses* itself in Eph. 1 : 9-12, if we are not mistaken.

16. The limitation of the blessing is a kind of threat. *Cf.* 1 : 10; Paul's voice is still for war.

**The Israel of God.** Men who, "though Jews by birth, yet because they have learned that a man is not justified by works of the law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ, have believed in Christ Jesus that they might be justified by faith in Christ," 2 : 15-16. Yet not these alone. The expression includes all true Christians, but the Hebraic form (*cf.* Ps. 125 : 5; 128 : 6) is chosen to show that Paul has no prejudice against the Jew as such, but only against those who refuse to "walk by this rule."

17. It is remarkable that Paul should borrow his closing note of defiance from the heathen formulæ in customary use upon amulets and in incantations, "Let no man trouble me, for I bear . . ." The expression **the marks of Jesus** may very probably refer to scars of Paul's many stripes, or even specifically to the recent marks of the

18. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Add subscription *Unto the Galatians, written from Rome.* Others further by *Paul and the brethren.* Others further by *the hand of Titus.* Others further and *Luke.*

lictors' rods in Philippi (1 Thess. 2 : 2; Acts 16 : 22-23). The word (*stigma*) is employed of branding or tattoo marks which placed the wearer under the protection of some patron or divinity. In regard to the rest of the verse it is probable, since the discovery in Egypt of many amulets and charms with similar inscriptions, that Paul purposely adopts the figure from heathen magic in order to symbolize how as partaker of the sufferings of Christ he is also under his protection.

18. The parting benediction is brief and formal; but as such the Galatians would at least know it to be sincere.

The so-called "subscriptions" appended by later copyists, increasing in length with lateness of date, are of no value. They merely illustrate the exclusive dependence of tradition on the book itself for their information. Thus the statement "written from Rome" is known to be based on a wrong inference from 4 : 20.



## APPENDED NOTES

NOTE A. THE CONTENT OF PAUL'S GOSPEL

NOTE B. THE JERUSALEM COMPACT, AND THE  
APOSTOLIC DECREES

NOTE C. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH, APART FROM  
WORKS OF LAW



## APPENDED NOTE A

### THE CONTENT OF PAUL'S GOSPEL

IN the note on 1:16 it has been intimated that the emphasis of Paul's message was otherwise placed than by those who had known Jesus "after the flesh." To him particular sayings and incidents of Jesus' earthly ministry were of value only as accessory to the great fact that the man of Nazareth had been "by the resurrection from the dead miraculously declared to be the Son of God promised in the holy scriptures" (Rom. 1:4; cf. Acts 17:31).

Paul had come to recognize through a divinely wrought opening of the eyes of his soul this promised "Son of God." This gave him his "gospel." In the Being whom he thus designated Paul saw not so much the national Deliverer of Israel as the deliverer of humanity from the thraldom of "flesh" and its attendant doom. A larger sense attaching to the term Son of God was inevitable in a convert of larger experience, training, and mode of thought than the Galilean apostles. But Paul's Deliverer of humanity was no other than that Friend of Sinners whose independent attitude toward synagogue orthodoxy had erstwhile provoked his fanatical antagonism. The implications of the recognition were momentous. But to appreciate its significance one must enter a realm of thought scarcely touched in the Synoptic Gospels. As every one realizes, the system of thought in which Christ appears as the Second Adam, rescuing a doomed race from the law of sin and death implanted in its members by the infusion of a higher dynamic, the "law of the Spirit of life," is widely different from that preached by Jesus in Galilee. Is it legitimate to identify the two?

Clearly Paul's antecedent ideas were profoundly tinged with Hellenistic stoicism (see note on 2:19). By as much as these were broader in scope than those of the Galilean apostles, by so much must Paul's conception of "grace in Christ" exceed theirs, once he had abandoned the attitude of legalistic exclusiveness. What in their case had been glad tidings for "publicans and sinners," became inevitably, for one who brought to his acceptance of the Christ the presuppositions of the Roman citizen of Tarsus and the pupil of Gamaliel, a gospel of salvation for all the posterity of Adam. It was still essentially a doctrine of salvation by "repentance toward

God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 20:21); but it must now include also "sinners of the Gentiles" (2:15), — nay, it must include the whole universe of rational beings. Every knee, whether of beings on earth, or above or under it, must bow to this Son of God, because it is for the manifestation of him and his that the creation has been groaning hitherto. Paul's gospel is therefore "a revelation by the resurrection" that *Jesus* is "the Son." And because this Son has relation to the whole creation of God — is, as Paul says, a "Second Adam" — the revelation of *him* constitutes of itself a commission to "preach him to the Gentiles," the sinners of Israel having already received the proclamation, Rom. 1:2-4; Acts 17:31.

Of the two terms of Paul's simple creed, "Jesus is the Christ," a creed given to him out of heaven, neither could be altered in its essential content by anything later learned from other Christians. Not that he did not welcome amplification. The title "Christ" obtained a more and more exalted sense as Paul brought the wild dreams of apocalyptic thought under subjection to the ethical principles of the law of Love. The name "Jesus" he gladly filled with larger meaning by subsequent conference with Peter (ver. 18); though even this continued fundamentally to signify to Paul what it had already signified to him as a persecutor, viz., the man who in his life, his teaching, his death, had done the utmost conceivable to break down the system of Pharisaic, legalistic salvation. But the outline remains the same. Paul's gospel is complete in the simple declaration, "Jesus is the Christ," or in more truly Pauline language, "Jesus is Lord."<sup>1</sup> Formerly this had driven Paul to the extremity of rage against the Nazarene. Now that his attitude toward "the law" was reversed his Pharisaic exclusiveness was changed to humanitarian inclusiveness. The one all-dominating characteristic of Paul's historic Jesus remained that he was "the end of the law" (Rom. 10:4; cf. Rom. *passim* and Gal. 4:4, 5). As regards the other term of his creed, Paul's definition of "the Christ" would necessarily obtain its chief enlargement from other sources than the teaching of his fellow-Christians. He purposely disregarded the merely nationalistic ideal as "fleshly" (Rom. 1:3; 2 Cor. 5:16). It must be confessed too that the ethical sonship always fundamental with Jesus (Mt. 5:45) tends to be overshadowed in Paul's mind by the apocalyptic expectations of "the Lord from heaven." The Old Testament passages which could be interpreted of a transcendental and preexistent Being, Ps. 8:7; 110:1 (1 Cor. 15:25-27); Dt. 30:12-14; Ps. 68:19 (Rom. 10:6-8; Eph. 4:8-10) were those on which Paul based his conception, just as apocalyptic literature, already tinctured with Gentile dualism and Greek cosmological

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rom. 10:9; 1 Cor. 8:6; 12:3; 2 Cor. 4:5; Phil. 2:11.

speculation, had itself become predominantly cosmic and humanitarian. Like Paul it already conceives the redemption as a deliverance of humanity from the curse inherent in the race since Adam's fall. And the "wisdom" literature is even more strongly humanitarian and universalistic. We cannot wonder that it should seem to Paul rather the duty of the Church to come up to the largeness of this universalistic conception of the Christ "promised afore by the prophets in the holy scriptures," than his duty to limit his "spiritual" view by the literalness of those who only knew a Christ "after the flesh."

And Paul had his way. The Greek humanitarian idea of "redemption" prevailed over the Jewish nationalistic. The test of orthodoxy became the confession "Jesus is Lord" (Rom. 10:9; 1 Cor. 12:3; 2 Cor. 4:5), interpreted as in Phil. 2:9-11. What Paul found in the person of Jesus identified with the preexistent Wisdom of God, through whom the world was created, the next generation identified with the Logos of Greek philosophy, as Philo a generation earlier had already done with the Wisdom of Prov. 8, Eccl. 24, and Wisd. of Sol., but without the intermediate link of incarnation. There is difference here. There is sweeping advance. But there is no perversion. What Paul found in the personality of Jesus subsequent generations have found, will find, and are entitled to find. Whether Jesus himself did or did not think of his mission as destined ever to extend beyond the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" does not affect the case. In showing to these the way of access to "sonship" he in fact did "open the kingdom of heaven to all believers." To-day it is only a plain matter of shrewd observation that "there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we may be saved, save the name of Jesus." The foundation of ultimate religion rests where Paul laid it, in the person of Jesus the Son of God.

## APPENDED NOTE B

### THE JERUSALEM COMPACT, AND THE APOSTOLIC DECREES

MUCH confusion is caused by failure to distinguish between the questions settled at Paul's wholly amicable interview with the "pillars" at Jerusalem, and the question left unsettled, which gave rise to the painful scene at Antioch described in Gal. 2: 11-20, and through it to all the misunderstanding, estrangement, and strife of the years between the First Missionary Journey and Paul's arrest. Luke indeed passes over this misunderstanding and strife in silence, but they are superabundantly evidenced by all the Pauline Epistles.

Both Paul and Luke make it clear that the question of circumcising Gentile converts and requiring them to keep the Mosaic law was raised in Jerusalem at this time and promptly settled in the negative. Luke even reports that Peter appealed to a precedent established by himself. Paul declares that the objections raised were a reaction against an earlier attitude of approval. Both imply greater toleration in the earlier period. Nothing is more probable. If even Jewish propagandists dispensed from circumcision,<sup>1</sup> the Christian reactionaries cannot have had great hopes from the "pillars." According to Paul the indorsement of his gospel of freedom from the law obtained at this private interview was the end of the matter so far as any apostolic countenancing of the demands of the reactionaries was concerned. On this point also Luke is in absolute accord. To doubt it is doubly absurd, because insistence on the yoke of the law would have made a rapid propaganda of the faith among Gentiles impossible, besides contradicting the whole spirit of Jesus' reform. Even the Nazarenes interpreted the breaking of "the yoke of his burden" first in, "Galilee of the Gentiles," afterwards in "the land of deep darkness" in Is. 9: 1-7, of the work of Jesus *and of Paul*.<sup>2</sup> Gentile freedom from the law was almost axiomatic.

We may go a step farther still in determining the agreements of Paul with Luke. The compact of mutual non-interference is in its very nature a recognition by Paul of the inviolability of Peter's "apostleship of the circumcision" as truly as a recognition by the

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* XX. ii. 4. <sup>2</sup> Jerome, *Commentary on Is.*, note on Is. 9: 1, *Opera*, ed. Vallarsi, Vol. IV. p. 130.

Pillars of Paul's "apostleship of the uncircumcision." Paul agrees not to dissuade Jews *already evangelized* from observing the law. In planting himself firmly upon this ground Luke is perfectly within the implications of Paul's own story. It is also clear, however, from the very Diary itself that Paul made no scruple of preaching freedom from the law to *unevangelized* Jews. In fact the synagogue was his habitual door of entrance in new fields. In omitting all reference to the division of missionary fields, and to the request of the Pillars for financial aid, Luke is doing no more than we should expect; for these are just such "private" understandings as are implied in Paul's description of the conference. But if the conference was so completely amicable, how could the disagreement come about? — If we follow Luke's narrative there not only *was* no disagreement, but there *could be* none, since the difficulty had been foreseen and provision made to meet the case by official enactment of four "decrees." Only by following Paul against Luke is there room for its occurrence. For the divergence is precisely here, that Luke inserts these public legislative enactments in his story of the (second) Jerusalem conference, while Paul explicitly excludes them.

An inherent defect of the agreement between Paul and the Pillars, taking Paul's own account of it, was its failure to provide for mixed communities. The compact is limited to mutual non-interference. To Paul there was here no difficulty, because, as we see from his argument against Peter and Barnabas, he assumed that other Jews when among Gentiles would do as he did himself, *viz.*, become "as without the law to them that are without the law." To his mind anything else was inconsistent with the Christian's fundamental principle of salvation by faith in Christ alone. By taking their stand upon this they had "destroyed" the law, and could not "build it up again" without "confessing themselves transgressors." James, Peter, and John were less likely to realize this defect in the compact, partly from lack of rabbinic training, partly because they had not had Paul's experience among the Gentiles. At all events the question what the Jew is to do who wishes to observe the law, and cannot do so without withdrawing from his Gentile brother-Christian, *was* left unsettled at the conference. The proof is that Peter at Antioch does not know what to do, but is first swayed by Paul's example, then by those "from James." "The rest of the Jews" and "even Barnabas" are equally uncertain, but finally take sides against Paul. On this point and this alone was there ever disagreement among the apostles. There is no intimation anywhere that Peter and Barnabas proposed to reimpose circumcision and "the yoke of the law" upon Gentile believers. The thing would be an absurdity at any time, a thousand-fold more absurd in the half-Gentile church of Antioch, when but shortly before the question had already been officially decided in their favor at Jerusalem. Paul does not utter

a syllable indicative of this incredible perfidy. He reproaches Peter with inconsistency for wishing to retain *his own* ceremonial superiority as a Jew, and thus exerting *indirectly* a kind of moral coercion upon the Gentiles. The old question, shall the Gentiles be free from the law, is not raised at all. None of the parties to *this* controversy have the slightest idea of reopening it at Antioch. But its settlement has brought up the new question, How then shall *the Jew* retain his cleanliness if he eats with Gentile believers?

We have seen how Paul answered this question, and that his answer was not satisfactory to the Jews. It is not satisfactory to Luke. Those who had indorsed Paul's gospel of freedom from the law for Gentiles had had no idea of admitting that *Jews* were free. But the indorsement of Paul's gospel as from God, once given, could not be rescinded. Barnabas, Peter, even James, were irrevocably committed to the doctrine that the Gentiles are saved "apart from works of law." They could only insist that Paul and his followers should exercise no coercion upon Jews, nor invade Jewish territory, with an iconoclastic propaganda. Paul admits this; and Luke knows it. What Paul will not admit is the converse, entrance into Gentile territory by apostles of the circumcision and "coercion of the Gentiles to live as do the Jews." The mere setting of the example of regard for Mosaic distinctions of meats is to him "coercion," Gal. 2: 14.

How extremely careful Paul was to avoid giving offence by disregard of the law among Jews, how scrupulously observant he was of his side of the compact, is evidenced over and over again in the great Epistles. This itself argues for similar respect on the other side. Recrudescence of the propaganda of the "false brethren" there was; invasion there was of Paul's mission field, particularly that in which he had worked with Barnabas; but certainly not with the connivance or sanction of Peter, Barnabas, or James. Paul, under the strained relations of the situation after the conflict at Antioch, makes, as we should expect, no further appeal to the Pillars to stop it. But the notion that Peter, or John, or even James, ever so stultified themselves as to oppose the gospel of Gentile freedom from the law which they had once unqualifiedly indorsed, is inadmissible. On the contrary, after Paul had covered all the field allotted to him "from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum" and was undertaking his last great missionary campaign to the very confines of the west, we find him hopefully undertaking another great Gentile Christian embassy to Jerusalem. Surrounded by a company of delegates from all the provinces of his Greek mission field, Paul "went in unto James" bearing the fruits of Gentile bounty in fulfilment of the promise made so many years before. It was a momentous interview, to obtain which the great Apostle to the Gentiles had willingly risked his life; but it certainly was not hopeless.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rom. 15: 30-33.

We have the less reason to question the general outline of the story of Acts at this point, that the Diary itself leads up to and beyond the very threshold of that audience. True it breaks off at the point where "Paul went in *with us*" and the story is rewritten, with large expansions and introduction of apologetic speeches. But why should we doubt Luke's general statement of fact? Paul surely at this time went as far as his principles would allow, to prove how loyally he had lived up to the compact. He could justly claim to have scrupulously abstained from any propaganda of his gospel of anti-legalism in Jewish Christian territory (Rom. 15:20). He had even changed his mode of life there to avoid giving offence (1 Cor. 9:20). Why then might he not assume the charges and perform the sacrifices for the Nazirites in the temple as James requested? Taken as an illustration of the Pauline principle, "all things to all men," "circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but a new creation," the transaction itself is scarcely open to reasonable objection. The objection lies against its employment to defend a different principle, opposed to that which Paul considers vital; *and in Acts 21:20-26 it is so employed.*

It is needless here to repeat what has already been said in the Introduction regarding the view-point of Luke on the two questions of Paul's apostleship and his gospel. Luke forsakes Paul at the point where Paul breaks with Peter and Barnabas and the rest of the Jews at Antioch. He thoroughly agrees with the spirit of the compact of mutual non-interference, that the gospel of circumcision shall be preached in Petrine territory, and the gospel of liberty from the law in Pauline. Indeed from the Jewish point of view he is more consistent with it than Paul. For to Paul the gospel of circumcision is *not* a true gospel but in part a delusion. Paul spares it for the sake of peace and goodwill; but he cannot indorse it. To Luke it is a real gospel, "another gospel," which Jews are under divine obligation to keep. Luke is not in sympathy with the idea that Jews are free from the law. On this point he stands with the Pillars. Hence the concessions without which fellowship in mixed churches would be impracticable, and which Paul demands as of right from the Jews, Luke imposes as "necessary" upon the Gentiles. It is but the logical result of this, together with his general assumptions regarding apostolic infallibility, that determines his version of the Jerusalem Conference. To him it is a true Apostolic Council.

The real visit of Paul and Barnabas, undertaken on account of the "false brethren privily brought in, which came in to spy out (Antiochian) liberty," remains indeed in Luke's narrative. He has even retained a hint of its occasion, the report of multitudinous Gentile conversions at Antioch carried to Jerusalem, with the consequent sending of Barnabas (Acts 11:22). Traces of its outcome also remain in the taking back of Mark and the First Missionary Journey. Just

as in Galatians Paul's description of his field of work antecedent to the compact includes only Syria and Cilicia without mention of Cyprus and Galatia, and the compact itself mainly concerns a division of territory *for the future*; so even Acts has traces that the so-called Famine-relief Visit is the visit of the Antiochian leaders. In Acts, however, the real significance of this momentous but "private" visit is eclipsed by the introduction of a version of Paul's "ministration" of the Gentiles which assimilates it to Josephus' story of the ministration of Helena of Adiabene during the famine of 46 A.D. For this purpose "Agabus," a figure who really belongs to the later story (cf. 21: 10), is brought in to prophesy the famine, whereupon the Antiochian Christians send their relief *before* its outbreak. The question of Gentile evangelization is postponed. But the inherent improbability of Gentile Christianity in Antioch remaining so long unmolested, and the surviving traces of the materials embodied, are all against this representation.

Not till after the First Missionary Journey has fully justified itself by its divine inception no less than by its glorious results does Luke permit the question of the reactionaries to be at last brought up in Jerusalem. Paul and Barnabas now go up a *second* time, but merely as delegates of Antioch, and all questions are settled by unanimous decision of "the apostles and elders." The Apostolic Council obviates all the controversy "concerning meats" and "eating with Gentiles" by four decrees enacted to safeguard from "the pollutions of idols" the Jews among the Gentiles who "hear Moses read every Sabbath in the synagogues."

To appreciate why critics generally regard these decrees as absolutely excluded by Paul's account of his conference with the Pillars it is needful to recognize their intrinsic bearing and the purpose for which Luke himself considers them to be introduced.

They are not regarded in Acts as trenching in any degree on the principle that Gentile converts are to be free from the law. That was a yoke, as Peter says, "which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." The question whether Gentiles could be saved without the law had been settled, as he reminds the assembly, "a good while ago." The decrees are proposed and carried without a word of dissent, "not to trouble them which from among the Gentiles turn to God"; but somehow for the advantage of the Jews among the Gentiles who "in every city hear Moses read every sabbath in the synagogues." Their intrinsic character shows how they were expected to operate to the advantage of these.

In regard to three of the four requirements it is clear that the prohibition applies to meats. The Gentile Christian's table will present no snare to his Jewish brother-Christian because, while not strictly *kosher* according to the highest standard of Pharisaism, it will avoid the causes of permanent uncleanness which the Jew in Gentile lands

holds in abhorrence because they affect the inward man, or the life. By abstaining from "meats offered to idols" he escapes the danger of "communion with demons" (1 Cor. 10: 19-22). By abstaining from "blood" he escapes the similar danger incurred through sacrifice against "the life" of the animal (Gen. 9: 4; Lev. 7: 22-27). The eating of "things strangled" involves a similar danger, because "the life" has not been permitted to "return to God who gave it."

But why the special prohibition of "fornication," as though the Jewish believer could be involuntarily contaminated by the moral laxity of the Gentile? So long as it was not realized that this was in actual fact the belief of primitive Christians, the naming of "fornication" among the "decrees" seemed to constitute an exception. It raised a barrier against understanding them as "necessary" conditions of fellowship between the two kinds of Christians. However great heathen laxity in this respect, who could thus assume that any body of real Christians might tolerate sexual immorality? For this reason many impossible suppositions have been made, even the suggestion that "the apostles and elders" undertook to impose on Gentile churches the Mosaic limitations of consanguinity in marriage, calling the type of wedlock in which many of their Gentile Christian brethren were living "fornication." Such incredible shifts only show the perplexity of the interpreter. In reality we have plenty of evidence that the "fornication" so common in heathenism as to be the typical "pollution of idols," and needing repeatedly to be warned against by Paul even in his Christian brotherhoods,<sup>1</sup> was regarded as conveying involuntary defilement to "those who eat and associate with" the offender. This belief is stated in so many words by the Jewish Christian writer of the *Clementine Homilies*, "Fornication and adultery differ from all other sins, in that they defile not only the offender, but *those also that eat and associate with him.*"<sup>2</sup> Hermas, writing in Rome about 130 A.D., has the same idea: "If a man continue in such deeds as these (adultery and sexual impurity) keep away from him, and live not with him. Otherwise *thou also art a partaker of his sin.*"<sup>3</sup> Paul himself insists on similar exclusion of the "fornicator," in particular from table fellowship. He had written to the Corinthians that they must "have no company with fornicators." They either could not or would not understand. He reiterates with emphasis that with such an one they must "no, not so much as eat." "Every other sin is without the body," but "He that is joined to a harlot takes away the members of Christ and makes them the members of a harlot." Therefore he must cease to be a "member" of the Church (1 Cor. 5: 9-13; 6: 13-20). In respect, then, to its being "necessary" for the protection of the Jewish Christian in Gentile communities against involuntary contamination from "the pollutions of idols" there is

<sup>1</sup> Gal. 5: 20; <sup>2</sup> Thess. 4: 3-8; <sup>3</sup> Cor. 5: 1-13; <sup>4</sup> 10: 7, 8; Rom. 1: 24-27; Eph. 5: 5; Col. 3: 5, 6, etc. <sup>2</sup> Clem, Hom. III. 68. <sup>3</sup> Mandate, IV, i.

nothing out of keeping with the rest of the “decrees” in the stipulation against “fornication.”

Paul, as we have seen, was strenuous in checking the tendencies to heathen laxity of morals in his churches, urging as an additional motive the scandal caused among fellow-believers by their indifference. He also forbids peremptorily participation in heathen banquets, on the ground that this is a kind of “communion with” the demon worshipped. He even commands abstinence from the meat placed before one in a neighbor’s house if a fellow-guest whispers, “This hath been offered to an idol.” However, at this point we reach an end of his agreement with the “decrees”; for he expressly goes on to point out that this abstinence from “meat sold in the shambles” is not a matter of requirement, but of gracious consideration for the weaker conscience. Abstinence from “blood” and “things strangled” is not even contemplated. The principle which governs his own ordinary conduct is that “there is nothing unclean of itself.” Only a timid conscience makes any food religiously objectionable; but to avoid leading such consciences astray he himself is willing to abstain from meat, or wine, or anything else, “while the world standeth.”

This very need among the Corinthians and Romans of pointing out what is lawful and what is not, in the matter of “meats” and the “pollutions of idols,” proves that here at least the Gentile believers had not received “the decrees for to keep.” Paul’s careful distinction between what his followers *must* do as of right, and what they ought to be willing to do out of brotherly consideration, shows that he had not bound himself and would not bind others to hard and fast rules of “touch not, taste not, handle not.” Not only, then, must we take in the strictest sense his positive declaration that the Pillars imposed no conditions whatever on their indorsement of the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles (Gal. 2: 6-10), but we must regard his insistence on Peter’s accommodating his Jewish scruples to Gentile practice in the matter of eating together at Antioch, as precluding any admission by Paul, then or afterwards, of the method of solving the problem of fellowship proposed by James. Concessions must be made, but Paul insists that the Jews must make them; because for them to stand upon legal “cleanness” is to build up again the wall of partition they had once destroyed.

After all there is nothing incomprehensible in the fact that Acts in this matter of the *modus vivendi* between Jewish and Gentile believers should go the way of Peter and Barnabas, the way of “James and the elders,” the way of Jerusalem and Antioch, and not the way of Paul. With Luke, Peter and James and “the apostles and elders” are authority infallible and absolute. Paul’s authority depends upon theirs, and cannot be conceived as conflicting with it. Moreover, the “decrees” are far from being an invention of his imagination. The very incongruity of their address with the situation they are made

to occupy in his narrative gives simultaneously a proof of their authenticity and an indication of their real occasion.

In the present story of Acts 13:1-16:5 the "decrees" are enacted to meet the particular case of the *Galatian* churches, and are therefore distributed among them "for to keep." But in the letter itself which embodies them no mention whatever is made of the *Galatians*, but they are explicitly addressed to "the brethren which are of the Gentiles in *Antioch and Syria and Cilicia*," the region affected by the "trouble" before the return of Paul and Barnabas from the First Missionary Journey.

We have seen that they cannot have been enacted before Peter's coming to Antioch. Otherwise his vacillation would be unaccountable.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary they meet the very contingency Peter was there facing. They apply the principle of the compact — mutual non-interference — to the question of table-fellowship in a manner contrary to the Pauline, which Peter had previously been following. Nothing stands in the way of the conclusion that these "decrees" were brought by the delegation "from James," to whose coming Paul attributes the origin of the whole disturbance (Gal. 2:12).

Aside from the fact that Luke brings down Paul and Barnabas a second time from Antioch to participate in his great Apostolic Conclave, and postpones to it what really — as his own account confesses — had been decided "a good while ago," the account of Acts 15:1-35 contains but little that might not correctly describe such a conclave. To Luke, of course, its attempted settlement is the true and final one. Instead of a conflict with Peter arising out of it, Paul distributes its decrees among his Galatian converts for to keep, and quiets the opposition of "the Jews that were in those parts" by circumcising Timothy,<sup>2</sup> a proof that "he himself walked orderly keeping the law."

This matter of the Jerusalem Council and its decrees permanently settling the Galatian crisis is a matter of immense importance to the author of Acts. He not only makes it central to his whole "treatise," but invokes on its behalf the authority of the entire college of "the apostles and elders" assembled in solemn conclave in Jerusalem, and prefacing the enactments with "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." If ever a Christian document claimed all possible sanctions of apostolicity, catholicity, and divine inspiration, it is this. Yet it seems to share the fate of all the ex cathedra utterances for which infallibility is claimed with greatest vehemence. They seem doomed to come into the world still-born. The joint attempt of Antioch and Jerusalem at ecumenical legislation was a failure from

<sup>1</sup> Even Zahn admits that Peter's conduct at Antioch would be "scarcely credible" after the enactment of the decrees. *Kommentar*, 1905, p. 111. <sup>2</sup> The fact itself is rather supported than made incredible by Gal. 5:2, 3, 11. It is the suppression of the converse case of the refusal to circumcise Titus, and the interest in which the fact is adduced, which makes Acts 16:1-5 unhistorical. See above on Acts 21:17-26, p. 121.

the start. Luke has gone to extraordinary lengths, it is true, to make it appear that Paul also accepted the principle that "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" are under obligation to keep the law, and that it is therefore "necessary" for their sakes that Gentile converts "keep the decrees." To give color to this view he transforms the whole nature of the third conference in Jerusalem, an interview at which the author of the Diary was himself present.

We know from the Epistles that Paul's main object in this great delegation from all the churches of the Gentiles to "James and the elders" was to convey his "ministration" which he had on their behalf, and that he was asking the prayers even of far-off Roman believers "that it might be acceptable to the saints," and that his life might be preserved against the threats of the "disobedient" as he went to convey it. It was his olive branch on behalf of a free, yet brotherly Gentile Christendom, proving the loyalty with which Paul and his followers had stood by the compact in its two principles of mutual respect and brotherly kindness. We know too from the Epistles that Paul peremptorily opposed the later inference by which Jerusalem undertook to say what concessions were "necessary" from the Gentiles. He even laid down a "must" of his own in the opposite sense. The Jews *must* make the concession, else they would be "coercing the Gentiles." We know on the other hand from the Epistles that Paul could and did engage in Jewish rites like a Jew when among Jews, and therefore could, and probably did, engage in sacrifices in the temple on behalf of Jewish Christian Nazirites. But we also know that if he did so it was to prove how free is the believing Jew to become "all things to all men, as without law to them that are without law," as well as "under law to them that are under the law." In Acts it is adduced in support of just the contrary principle. It exhibits Paul as officially showing how by precept and example he has always maintained that the believing Jew is *not* free, and that *because* he is not, even his Gentile fellow-Christian must in some degree be "entangled in his yoke of bondage."

In spite of these sweeping claims for their ecumenical authority and acceptance, the Jerusalem decrees can never have obtained currency in the Pauline churches. Only Jerusalem could have been fatuous enough to think it a practicable mode of settlement of the question of fellowship to demand that Gentile tables should be partially *kosherized* throughout the world for the benefit of the Christian Jew. Antioch yielded, as we know; for south of the Cilician Gates the Jewish element in the churches was still strong, though gradually weakening as the preponderance of Gentile converts increased, and the Synagogue drew off in more and more bitter hostility. North of the Taurus range the Judaizers, though they now reverted to something like their original propaganda of circumcision and the law, did not even secure the compromise of the four decrees. Galatia

appears well represented in the Pauline delegation to James, and we have later evidence of the gradual relaxation of the Petrine demands. About 85 to 90 A.D. Luke of Antioch in Syria still thinks it possible to enforce the decrees of James in the Gentile world. But that is the last trace we have of the attempt to prohibit "things strangled" and "blood." Even the Syrian church manual of about 120 A.D., the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, no longer insists upon these. "Concerning foods bear what thou art able" is its direction to the catechumen; but with decided leaning toward the rule which we find subsequently prevailing among the Pauline churches, it adds, "However, abstain by all means from meats offered to idols, for it is the food of dead gods." Among "the churches of Asia" in 95 A.D. we find the stipulations reduced to these two, which in substance really had the indorsement of Paul. Those who hold "the teaching of Balaam" who led Israel to commit fornication and to eat things offered to idols" are denounced. Upon the rest the Spirit imposes "no other burden" (Rev. 2: 14, 20-24). About 150 A.D., when the Western text of Acts gained currency, the "decrees" were revised by the elimination of the prohibition of "things strangled" and the addition of the "golden rule." This permitted them to be taken as general precepts of morality, "blood" being interpreted metaphorically as "violence" or "injury." Thus at last, with the disappearance of the Jewish element from the Church, the very understanding of the "decrees" disappears, together with the occasion for their existence. Neither Paul's solution of the problem of fellowship by concessions on the Jewish side, nor James' by concessions from the Gentile side, remains. The issue in the second century is no longer between Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian, but between Christian and Jew, or Christian and heathen. Hence the rule now becomes simply: "Abstain from fornication, it is a heathen vice that contaminates the whole brotherhood. Abstain from meats offered to idols, it is the food of dead gods."

Scarcely less significant of the Lukan point of view than this misinterpretation of Paul's attitude at the Conference with James in Acts 21: 17-26 is the suppression of the whole matter of his "ministration." It is not merely that the great contribution conveyed by at least eight delegates of the Greek churches besides Paul, for whose favorable reception Paul entreats the prayers of the Roman Christians, is ignored by Luke. In the only allusion remaining it is given an entirely *different* significance. In his speech before Felix, Paul is made to say: "I came to bring alms to my nation and offerings." This was not the real occasion of his coming. The "ministration," on the other hand, which was the real occasion, is carried back to the time of its original proposal in the conference of Paul and Barnabas with the Pillars; but even there it is *credited to the account of Antioch*. This, taken in conjunction with the description of An-

## APPENDED NOTE B

---

tioch as the first Gentile Christian church, the note that it was there that the name "Christian" originated, the crediting to Antioch of the initiative in the evangelization of the whole Gentile world, and of what Luke considers the ecumenical settlement of the basis of fellowship, is a strong confirmation of the tradition cited by Eusebius of the Antiochian origin of "Luke." The view-point which we have found so strikingly in contrast with that of Paul can now define itself. It is the aspect the story of the great Galatian crisis presented in Antioch a quarter century or so after the death of Paul. On the other hand the letters themselves show not only a greater crisis, but a greater gospel and a greater man.

## APPENDED NOTE C

### JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH, "APART FROM" WORKS OF LAW

As a rule it forms no part of the commentator's province to justify, but only to elucidate, his author. But much of the misunderstanding of Paul's great doctrine of Justification by faith is really due to certain associations of ideas connected with the term "justify," which compel the mind to question its validity. The validity of the doctrine becomes readily apparent when we cease to connect with this term the notion of a *judge*, and connect it with the action of a *father*. And surely not to Jesus only, but to Paul also, Father is the more appropriate name for God.

To "justify" (spoken of God) is not to *make* just, and is not merely (as Judge) to *declare* just (acquit). It is in every respect (both as Judge and as Father) to *treat* as just. "Faith" is the attitude of mind corresponding to and conditioning this fatherly disposition of God, *i.e.* filial trust and obedience. Without it God cannot be just and still *treat* as just the ungodly. This is the heart of the Pauline message. John the prophet preached "repentance": Turn ye, O Israel, for why will ye die? Jesus the Son preached "faith." If ye do turn, your Father may be trusted always, for everything, to the uttermost. Paul the theologian preached "justification": an interpretation of the significance of the cross as the central factor in the divine redemption.

Once the term "justification" has been broadened to connote the action of a father as well as that of a judge, the vindication of this Pauline philosophy of redemption, both in itself and as a true corollary of the teaching and life of Jesus, can be put in a nutshell. To *declare* the unjust just is immoral, no matter what the legal fiction. To *treat* the unjust as just may be right or wrong, wise or unwise, according to his attitude and disposition.

To "treat as just" the man who has only "works," no matter how perfect, is superficial. It may produce an immoral result, for the motive may be — it will always tend to be — mere expediency. God, therefore, "who looketh upon the heart," does not "justify on the ground of works."

To do anything less than "treat as just" the man who comes to God in "faith," no matter how imperfect in works, would be unrighteous; for the disposition of filial trust and obedience will inevitably produce the works in good time. Therefore, God, whose treatment of men is determined by what they really *are*, or may be, and not by what they have done, does justify "on the ground of faith apart from (*choris*) works."

The problem of redemption thus reduces simply to the question how to produce this "faith." To Paul it is the cross which answers it, just as the very existence of this problem itself explains the necessity of the cross. Reasoning from his own hopeless struggle under the law to obtain "a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law," Paul believed that something similar to his own self-condemnation must occur in the moral history of every man, even Gentiles which have not the law being a law unto themselves, their consciences, in each specific action, excusing or else accusing them. "Wherefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art." To produce the sense of guilt was the very function of prescriptive law. Given in a deeper and ultimate sense "unto life," Paul himself had found it "unto death." He regards it therefore as given primarily "for the sake of transgression"—yes, even as provocative of transgression.<sup>1</sup> The ministry of it, therefore, to which many alleged ministers of Christ were giving themselves so ardently, was at best a "ministry of condemnation."<sup>2</sup>

How, then, produce faith? This was the work of God. What the law could not do in that it was weak through the (inherent incapacity of fallen) flesh, God did, by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and (as an offering) for sin. Men would not have been able to believe in the wideness of God's mercy had he not "commended his own love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us."<sup>3</sup> The "ministry of reconciliation" (atonement), therefore, is defined very carefully to be this work of God in producing faith in himself in hearts reduced to moral death and despair. Paul compares it most appropriately to the raising of Christ from physical death. It was Paul's own resurrection. God who (in the physical creation) caused the light to shine out of darkness shines in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of his glory (*i.e.* his forgiving love; cf. Ex. 33:19-34:6) in the face of Jesus Christ.<sup>4</sup>

This, then, is the ministry of the atonement: "to wit, that God was in Christ *reconciling the world unto himself*, not reckoning unto them their trespasses."<sup>5</sup> The difficulties in the way of forgiveness overcome by the cross are indeed twofold; but the root of both is in the nature of man, not in the nature of God. Man is (1) incredulous

<sup>1</sup> Gal. 3:19-22; Rom. 4:15; 7:7-15. <sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. 3:6-11. <sup>3</sup> Rom. 4:18  
24; 5:6-10. <sup>4</sup> 2 Cor. 4:6. <sup>5</sup> 2 Cor. 5:14-21.

## APPENDED NOTE C

---

of the extent of God's love; (2) disposed to accept the proof of it as evidence of indulgent laxity. The cross meets both. Man's disposition is changed by it, not God's. "While we were yet weak," "while we were enemies," we were "reconciled to God through the death of his Son." Also when God "set him forth in his blood, to be a votive offering through faith," he "showed his own righteousness, notwithstanding his forbearance in passing over sins done aforetime." For in the great cost to himself of this means of redemption God proved himself just (*i.e.* unswerving in his determination to produce in men likeness to his own moral perfectness), while he *treated as* just him that had faith in Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Both aspects of Paul's doctrine of the cross are covered in the single statement: "He died for all, that they which live might no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again."<sup>2</sup> Paul's "ministry of the new covenant," his ambassadorial message of reconciliation was given him "when it pleased God to manifest his Son in" the last and greatest of the apostles.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 4:25-5:10; 3:21-26. <sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. 5:15. <sup>3</sup> Gal. 1:16; cf. 2 Cor. 4:1-6; 5:16-21.



## INDEX

ABRAHAM, 73, 75, 79, 92; inheritance of, 73, 85; promise to, 76, 80.

ACHAIA, 33.

ACTS, 9, 11, 16 f., 38, 125.

ADAM, 84 f.; Second, 115.

ADENEY, 26.

ADOPTION, 85, 87 f., 97.

ALLEGORY, 93.

ANALYSIS (of Gal.), 41 ff.

ANGELS, 37, 80, 86, 89.

ANTIOCH, Pisidian, 17 f., 19, 21 ff.; Syrian, 13, 15 f., 23, 29, 31, 33, 38, 65, 120 ff., 125, 127 f.

APOCALYPTIC WRITERS, 74.

APOSTLES, and Elders, 13 f., 124 ff.; False, 35.

APOSTLESHIP, 11, 13, 15 f., 47, 57, 63.

APOSTOLIC COUNCIL. See JERUSALEM CONCLAVE.

ARABIA, 54.

ARISTIDES, 28.

*Assumptio Mosis*, 81.

ATHENAGORAS, 28.

ATONEMENT, 48, 130.

AUTHORSHIP (of Gal.), 7 ff.

BACON (*Story of St. Paul*), 28; (*Journ. of Theol.*), 38.

BAPTISM, 83.

BARNABAS, 13, 15 ff., 24, 29, 32 ff., 58.

BAUER, 9.

BAUR, 9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, 42 ff.

BITHYNIA, 18.

BLOOD, eating of, 123 ff.

BOUSSET, 21.

BRETHREN, 33; false, 61.

CALENDAR, 37, 88.

CANONICITY, 4 ff.

CEPHAS, 29, 34, 65.

CHRIST PARTY, 35.

CHURCH, 53.

CHURCHES of Galatia, 18 ff., 24, 38, 125.

CIRCUMCISION, 31, 96 ff., 109, 119; of Timothy, 98, 125; of Titus, 60.

CLEMENT OF ROME, 5, 8 f.

*Clementine Homilies*, 36, 123.

CODICES, 2.

COLOSSIANS, 26 f.

COMMUNICATE, 109.

CONTRIBUTIONS, 22.

CORINTH, 26, 29, 32, 34, 37.

COVENANT, 79, 93.

CYBELE, priests of, 99.

CYPRUS, 17, 34.

DAMASCUS, 54.

DECREES of Jerusalem, 40, 122 ff.

DERBE, 33.

DEVOUT PERSONS, 31.

DIARY of Acts, 9, 12, 119.

DIATRIBE, 28.

*Diognetus, Ep. to*, 28.

DISSIMULATION of Peter, 65.

ELEMENTS of the world, 86, 89.

ENEMY (epithet of Paul), 91.

EPHESIANS, 26 f.

# INDEX

EPHESUS, 18 ff.  
 ESCHATOLOGY, 49.  
 ESDRAS, Second, 85.  
 FAITH, 70, 129 f.  
 FORNICATION, 123 f., 127.  
 FREEDOM, 96, 101.  
 FREER MANUSCRIPT, 3.  
 GAIUS, 22.  
 GALATIA, 19, 24; Paul's visits to, 38.  
 GALATIANS (people), 24, 29, 31.  
     (letter), text, 1-4; canonicity, 4-7; authorship, 7-11; internal evidence, 8, 29; relation to Acts, 11; to whom written, 17; date, 25, 29; relation to Romans, 26 ff.  
 GEOGRAPHY of Paul, 24.  
 GILBERT (*Acts*), 11 f.  
 GLORYING, 106, 109.  
 GOSPEL of Paul, 11, 13, 15, 47, 50, 52, 107, 115 ff.; of circumcision, 121.  
 HAGAR, 93.  
 HARNACK, 13.  
 HEIR, 88.  
 HELENA of Adiabene, 122.  
 HERMAS, 123.  
 HILLEL, 102.  
 HOLTZMANN (H. J.), 27.  
 ICONIUM, 25.  
 IGNATIUS, 5, 7, 9.  
 ISAAC, 92, 95.  
 ISAIAH, 94.  
 ISAIAN APOCALYPSE, 28.  
 ISHMAEL, 92, 95.  
 ISRAEL of God, 110.  
 JAMES (of Jerusalem), 13 f., 33, 35, 55, 62, 65, 118 ff.  
 JEROME, 118.  
 JERUSALEM, Compact, 32, 118 ff.; Conclave, 12, 17, 38, 40; decrees, 122 ff.; visits, 16, 23, 29, 32, 55, 57.  
 JESUS (as Lord), 116.  
 JOHN, 62 f.  
     (Gospel), 7.  
 JOSEPHUS (*Antiquities*), 80, 118.  
 JUDAIZERS, 22 f., 28 f., 31, 33 ff., 38, 96, 126.  
 JUSTIFICATION, 67, 129 ff.  
 JUSTIN MARTYR, 6, 8, 10.  
 KERYGMAS, 28.  
 KOSHER MEATS, 122.  
 LAW, works of, 68, 77, 80 f., 83, 97, 99, 102, 106.  
 LETTERS OF COMMENDATION, 37.  
 LIGHTFOOT, 7, 20, 26, 81 f., 83, 99.  
 LUKE, 13 ff., 19, 40, 118 ff., 127.  
 LUTHER, 41.  
 LYCAONIA, 18, 20.  
 LYSTRA, 20, 22, 33.  
 MACEDONIA, 21 f., 29, 33.  
 MAN-PLEASER, 51.  
 MARCION, 1, 4, 6, 10, 61, 82.  
 MARK, 17.  
 MEATS, distinctions of, 120, 122.  
 MEDIATOR, 81.  
 MINISTRATION (at Jerusalem), 40, 64, 126 f.  
 MIRACLES, 75.  
 MISSIONARY JOURNEY, First, 17 ff., 21, 32, 121 f.; Second, 18, 21, 23.  
 MOSES, 81, 84, 122.  
*Muratorian Fragment*, 2.  
 MYSIA, 20.  
 MYSTIC UNION with Christ, 70.  
 NORTH GALATIA, 20.  
 NORTH GALATIAN THEORY, 20 ff.  
 ORDER OF EVENTS, 38 ff.

# INDEX

PAPYRI (magic), 89.  
PAUL, apostleship and gospel, 11, 13, 15 f., 47, 57; early career, 15, 55; illness, 21, 90; charged with dishonesty, 37.  
*Paul and Thekla*, 25.  
PERSECUTION, 95, 109.  
PETER, 13, 15, 25, 29, 34 f., 63, 118 ff.  
*Peter, Preaching of*, 28.  
PHILO (*Vita Mosis*), 81, 95.  
PHRYGIA, 18 ff., 24.  
PHRYGO-GALATIC REGION, 25.  
PILLARS (at Jerusalem), 29, 38, 40, 59, 64, 118 ff.  
PISIDIA, 18.  
PLINY, 25.  
POLYCARP, 6 f.  
POSTSCRIPT, 108.  
PRACTICAL EXHORTATION, 101.  
*Psalms of Solomon*, 51.  
PTOLEMY, 25.  
  
RAMSAY, 19.  
REVELATION (to Paul), 52, 59.  
ROME, 12, 29.  
RUDIMENTS. See ELEMENTS.  
  
SABBATIZING, 90.  
SEED of Abraham, 80, 85.  
SILAS (Silvanus), 17, 30, 33.  
SIMON MAGUS, 36.  
SINAI, 93.  
SORCERY, 104.  
SPIRIT, gift of, 73; doctrine of, 102.

SPIRITUAL persons, 104.  
SPITTA, 27.  
STECK, 7, 21, 26 f.  
STOICISM, 115.  
STOICS, 82, 102 f.  
SUBSCRIPTIONS, 111.  
SYNAGOGUE, 31, 126.  
SYRIA AND CILICIA, 56, 122, 125.  
  
TACITUS, 25.  
TATIAN, 28.  
*Teaching of the Twelve*, 48, 66, 127.  
TERTULLIAN, 61.  
THESSALONIANS, 28, 32.  
TIMOTHY, 19, 22, 30, 33, 125.  
TITUS, 14, 58.  
TONGUES, 87, 103.  
TROAS, 22.  
  
VAN MANEN, 27.  
VISITS of Paul, to Galatia, 90; to Jerusalem, 16, 23, 29, 32, 55, 57, 121 f.  
VÖLTER, 27.  
  
WARFIELD (*Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*), 15.  
WEAK BRETHREN, 30, 34, 62.  
WESTERN TEXT, 2.  
WISDOM OF SOLOMON, 69, 117.  
WISDOM WRITERS, 74, 117.  
WORKS OF LAW, 68, 129.  
WORLD-RULERS, 86 f.  
  
ZAHN, 32 f., 82, 92, 125.  
ZEALOTS, 53.



# The Bible for Home and School

SHAILER MATHEWS, General Editor

---

## HEBREWS

By E. J. GOODSPEED

*50 cents; by mail, 55 cents*

## ACTS

By GEORGE H. GILBERT

*75 cents; by mail, 82 cents*

## GALATIANS

By B. W. BACON

*Now ready*

## GENESIS

By H. G. MITCHELL

*Now ready*

## I SAMUEL

By L. W. BATTEN

*In preparation*

## PSALMS

By J. P. PETERS

*In preparation*

## ISAIAH

By JOHN E. MCFADYEN

*In preparation*

## AMOS, HOSEA, and MICAH

By J. M. P. SMITH

*In preparation*

## JOHN

By SHAILER MATHEWS

*In preparation*

## ROMANS

By E. I. BOSWORTH

*In preparation*

## EPHESIANS and COLOSSIANS

By GROSS ALEXANDER

*In preparation*

The chief characteristics of the new series are its use of the Revised Version in 1881, its exclusion of all processes from the notes, the briefness of its explanations, and its general sympathy with the best that is in modern Bible study.

---

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

# NEW TESTAMENT HANDBOOKS

Each \$1.00 net

EDITED BY

SHAILER MATHEWS

*Professor of New Testament History and Interpretation,  
University of Chicago*

## The History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament

Prof. MARVIN R. VINCENT, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Union Theological Seminary.

Professor Vincent's contributions to the study of the New Testament rank him among the first American exegetes. His most recent publication is "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon" ("International Critical Commentary"), which was preceded by a "Students' New Testament Handbook," "Word Studies in the New Testament," and others.

## The History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament

Prof. HENRY S. NASH, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Cambridge Divinity School.

Of Professor Nash's "Genesis of the Social Conscience," *The Outlook* said: "The results of Professor Nash's ripe thought are presented in a luminous, compact, and often epigrammatic style. The treatment is at once masterful and helpful, and the book ought to be a quickening influence of the highest kind; it surely will establish the fame of its author as a profound thinker, one from whom we have a right to expect future inspiration of a kindred sort."

## Introduction to the Books of the New Testament

Prof. B. WISNER BACON, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Yale University.

Professor Bacon's works in the field of Old Testament criticism include "The Triple Tradition of Exodus," and "The Genesis of Genesis," a study of the documentary sources of the books of Moses. In the field of New Testament study he has published a number of brilliant papers, the most recent of which is "The Autobiography of Jesus," in the *American Journal of Theology*.

## The History of New Testament Times in Palestine

Prof. SHAILER MATHEWS, Professor of New Testament History and Interpretation, The University of Chicago.

*The Congregationalist* says of Prof. Shailer Mathews's "The Social Teaching of Jesus": "Re-reading deepens the impression that the author is scholarly, devout, awake to all modern thought, and yet conservative and preëminently sane. If, after reading the chapters dealing with Jesus' attitude toward man, society, the family, the state, and wealth, the reader will not agree with us in this opinion, we greatly err as prophets."

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

## NEW TESTAMENT HANDBOOKS—*Continued*

### **The Teaching of Jesus**

---

Prof. GEORGE B. STEVENS, Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University.

Professor Stevens's volumes upon "The Johannine Theology," "The Pauline Theology," as well as his recent volume on "The Theology of the New Testament," have made him probably the most prominent writer on biblical theology in America. His new volume will be among the most important of his works.

### **The Biblical Theology of the New Testament**

Prof. E. P. GOULD, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia.

Professor Gould's Commentaries on the Gospel of Mark (in the "International Critical Commentary") and the Epistles to the Corinthians (in the "American Commentary") are critical and exegetical attempts to supply those elements which are lacking in existing works of the same general aim and scope.

"An excellent series of scholarly, yet concise and inexpensive New Testament handbooks."—*Christian Advocate*, New York.

"These books are remarkably well suited in language, style, and price, to all students of the New Testament."—*The Congregationalist*, Boston.

---

Also by SHAILER MATHEWS

### **The Church and the Changing Order**

"A most interesting and valuable contribution to the literature of a subject that is growing in popular attention every day. While among the deeply, really religious and genuinely scientific there is no conflict or antagonism where even there is not accord, this unfortunately is not commonly the case among the masses who have only caught the forms of religious and scientific knowledge without their spirit. This book is addressed much more it seems to the religious than the scientific, possibly because the latter have the less need for repentance. Those who are troubled in any way at the seeming conflict between the demands of faith, on the one hand, and the experiences of their own reason and the problems of modern social and industrial life will find here much sage, illuminating, and practical counsel."—*Evening Post*.

---

*Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net*

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**  
64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

Complete in one volume, printed in clear type on Croxley Mills Bible paper, attractively bound in cloth or leather, with gilt top and title.

---

THE  
**Modern Reader's Bible**

The Sacred Scriptures Presented in  
Modern Literary Form

Edited, with an Introduction and Notes,  
by RICHARD G. MOULTON, M.A., PH.D.

*Olive green cloth, gilt top, \$2.00 net; by mail, \$2.17. Limp  
morocco, round corners, full gilt, \$5.00 net; by mail, \$5.17.*

---

“The ‘Modern Reader’s Bible’ is altogether admirable and of special value.”—HENRY C. POTTER, *Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church*.

“To the student, and to all persons who relish truth in its finest form of expression, it is a positive boon.”—JOHN F. HURST, *Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church*.

“I look for a large increase of interest in the Bible, for a much better understanding of its general spirit and teaching, and especially for an increased appreciation of its inspirational power, from the publication of the ‘Modern Reader’s Bible.’”—LYMAN ABBOTT, *Editor The Outlook*.

---

PUBLISHED BY

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**  
64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK



## Date Due

AP 7 '38

AP 21 '38

AP 21 '38

AP 21 '38

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]





BS491 .B58 48  
Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the  
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00006 4172